

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS: THE IMPACT OF PATROL OFFICERS  
ON SOLVING CRIME

Charissa L. Womack, B.S.B.A

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2007

APPROVED:

Eric J. Fritsch, Committee Chair

John Liederbach, Committee Member

Peggy Tobolowsky, Committee Member

Robert Taylor, Chair of the Department of  
Criminal Justice

Thomas Evenson, Interim Dean of the College of  
Public Affairs and Community Service

Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse  
School of Graduate Studies

Womack, Charissa L., *Criminal Investigations: The Impact of Patrol Officers on Solving Crime*. Master of Science (Criminal Justice), May 2007, 115 pages, 17 tables, references, 33 titles.

This two-part study of the criminal investigation process first evaluated the frequency with which patrol officers solve cases assigned to the investigations division and then examined how detectives spent their time, both on case assignments and on other activity not related to current case assignment. Cases assigned to the investigations division for follow up were examined to determine how often a case was cleared by the patrol officer. The detective's time was then evaluated in order to determine how much time detectives spent on investigative tasks and other activities. This study confirms that the patrol officer should be given more time to conduct preliminary investigations for specific cases, and that tasks performed by detectives could be shifted to other personnel in the department. Both actions should serve to positively impact case clearance rates.

Copyright 2007

by

Charissa L. Womack

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Changing course in life is never easy and is never done alone. Earning my master's degree has been a challenging process, and I am truly grateful to many, many people who gave me the confidence and inspiration to believe that I could begin a new career in an entirely new field of study.

I would like to thank my parents, my brothers and my sister who have been so supportive and understanding of those times when I have been unavailable to the family while earning this degree. I would also like to thank, Donna Duncan, my best friend, for being the catalyst that was responsible for my decision to earn this degree. October 6, 2004, your birthday I forgot, brought to light my lapse in life goals and challenged me to believe I could change myself for the better.

I would like to thank the faculty and staff of the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of North Texas who gave me the confidence and desire not only to study criminal justice but to love it. I have very much appreciated all the times you have treated me like one of your own, and am grateful for all those opportunities you each gave me to help where I was needed. Your knowledge and professionalism is unmatched in this field, and I will remember each of you forever. Thank for you this awesome journey.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee, Dr. Eric Fritsch, Dr. John Liederbach, and Dr. Peggy Tobolowsky for your guidance, rapid response to questions, and your tireless assistance during this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Lorenzo Boyd for being part of my thesis process early on, and providing me with so much help and information. You are each amazing teachers, and I appreciate your willingness to give me your time and talent so that I could be a better student and achieve this goal. I would also like to thank my husband Stan

Womack and friend and fellow student Barbara Madore for helping me code the data in so many police reports. I couldn't have done this project without you.

A special thank you goes to Dr. Eric Fritsch for being such a huge supporter of my academic career, a mentor and a friend. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be your graduate assistant, working with you in your classes and on the *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* journal. You have steadied my unsure steps more times than you will possibly ever know which has enabled me to succeed in this program.

I would like also especially thank Mr. Edward Hueske for opening my eyes to the world of criminalistics and criminal investigation. You truly are an inspiration! I will forever appreciate your taking me under your wing and allowing me the opportunity to be your graduate assistant and friend. Knowing you has left me with a true hunger to learn about criminal justice, and I am forever grateful for your time, your encouragement, and your absolute talent over these past two years. You have shown me a world I would have otherwise never known.

And most importantly, I give my thanks and devotion to my husband and best friend, Stan and to our children Stephanie and Steven, the most incredible people I have ever known. I am forever grateful for your sacrifice, encouragement and support over the past two years. Anything I have accomplished, however big or small, has been because of you. Thank you so much for allowing me to dream a big dream.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	6
Question 1: The Patrol Officer’s Role in Solving Crime.....	6
Major Studies on the Role of the Patrol Officer in Criminal Investigations .....	7
The Rand Report .....	8
The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) Study ...	10
National Survey of Police Policies and Practices .....	11
The Preliminary Investigation Process .....	13
Patrol Utilization Models .....	14
Conducting the Preliminary Investigation .....	16
The Initial Report.....	20
The Case Screening Process .....	23
Question 2: The Investigator’s Activities .....	26
Major Studies on the Role of the Detective in Criminal Investigation.....	27
The Rand Report .....	28
The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) Study ...	29
Limitations of the Rand and PERF Studies .....	31
National Survey of Police Policies and Practices .....	32
The Follow-Up Investigation Process.....	33
Summary .....	38
3. METHODOLOGY .....	40
The Richardson Police Department .....	41
Current Process for Case Management.....	42
Question 1: The Patrol Officer’s Role in Solving Crime.....	42

	The Cases Selected .....	42
	Assignment of Clearance Factors .....	45
	Definition of Clearance Factors .....	47
	Assignment of Completion Factors .....	51
	Definition of Completion Factors .....	53
	Limitations of the Study.....	56
	Subjective Nature of Data Coding .....	56
	Variance in Initial Report Narrative .....	57
	Inter-rater Reliability .....	57
	Question 2: The Investigator's Activities .....	58
	Case-Related Investigation .....	59
	All Other Activity .....	60
	Data Analysis .....	61
	Limitations of the Study.....	62
4.	RESEARCH FINDINGS .....	63
	Question 1: The Patrol Officer's Role in Solving Crime.....	63
	The Impact of Cases Cleared by Exception.....	69
	Question 2: The Investigator's Activities .....	78
	Case-Related Investigation .....	79
	All Other Activity .....	82
	Summary .....	85
5.	DISCUSSION .....	86
	Question 1: The Patrol Officer's Role in Solving Crime.....	86
	Principal Findings .....	86
	Implications: Use of Civilians to Free Patrol Officer's Time .....	88
	Question 2: The Investigator's Activities .....	91
	Principal Findings .....	91
	Implications: Use of Civilians in the Investigations Division ....	92
	Example of Estimated Time Savings .....	95
	Discussion on Civilianization .....	97
	Benefits of Civilianization .....	98
	Limitations of Civilianization .....	99

Conclusion .....	101
Appendices	
A: CASE FILE CODE SHEET.....	103
B: INVESTIGATOR’S TIME CARD CASE ACTIVITY SHEET .....	105
C: INVESTIGATOR’S TIME CARD ALL OTHER ACTIVITY .....	110
REFERENCES .....	112



## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Preliminary Investigation Activities .....	17
2. Frequency of Tasks Performed during Preliminary Investigation .....	19
3. Follow-Up Investigation Activities.....	35
4. Frequency of Tasks Performed during Follow-Up Investigation .....	36
5. Systematic Sampling Protocol .....	44
6. Sample Selected by IBR Code .....	44
7. Clearance Factors.....	47
8. Case-Related Investigative Tasks .....	60
9. Investigator's Tasks Not Related to Current Case Assignments .....	61
10. Patrol Officer Involvement in Solving Cases Cleared by Exception and Arrest.....	64
11. Case Completion by Offense for Cases Cleared by Exception and Arrest.....	68
12. Sample Selected by IBR Code for Cases Cleared by Exception and Arrest .....	70
13. Patrol Officer Involvement in Solving Cases Cleared by Arrest.....	72
14. Case Completion by Offense for Cases Cleared by Arrest.....	76
15. Investigator's Time on Case-Related Activities .....	80
16. Investigator's Time on Other Activities .....	82
17. Example of Estimated Time Savings through Civilianization.....	95

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

As a Law Enforcement Officer, my fundamental duty is to serve mankind; to safeguard lives and property; to protect the innocent against deception; the weak against oppression or intimidation; and the peaceful against violence or disorder; and to respect the Constitutional rights of all men to liberty, equality, and justice.

*Law Enforcement Code of Ethics (Adams, 2001, p. xiii)*

The Law Enforcement Code of Ethics identifies the primary vision of the police officer in the United States. This vision establishes the “what” of law enforcement, the officer’s basic duty. The “how” of this vision, how the officer conducts what is observed to be his duty, is subject to change based on research in the criminal justice field, the goals of the community, changes in technology, and the changing nature of crime itself over time. To most citizens, the uniformed police officer represents the government, and is the most visible representative of governmental power seen on a daily basis. The police officer is looked to as a problem solver, and often asked to be a social mediator between conflicting citizens, in essence the referee between good and evil. The police officer is expected to serve with a sense of justice, showing equal dedication and respect to all members of the community (Adams, 2001).

Law enforcement is locally controlled and structurally decentralized so that each department is responsible for the policies and procedures that govern how the organization will carry out its statutory duties to serve the community. The major functions of a police department include the following: protect life and property; enforce the laws; prevent crime; preserve the peace; arrest violators; and serve the public. Local, county and state governments, as well as the federal government, enact laws that give authority to the individual agencies to carry out these assigned duties (Bohm & Haley, 2005). Crime control, one of the primary duties of law

enforcement, is carried out through the services of patrol officers and criminal investigators (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

Criminal investigation is a systematic and thorough process undertaken by law enforcement to examine and resolve suspected criminal activity in a professional manner while maintaining public confidence in the police department. A criminal investigation is primarily conducted in order to detect crime, preserve evidence of the crime, and then enable the police to identify, apprehend and convict the perpetrator. Secondary goals of the investigation include preventing and clearing additional crimes, recovering stolen property, gathering intelligence information, and training police personnel (Horvath & Messig, 2001; Lyman, 1999; McDevitt, 2005).

This process begins when the police first become aware that a crime or potential crime has occurred, either because a victim has come forward or because the police have discovered criminal activity. A thorough and systematic examination of the person or event in question is conducted in order to collect facts or information while refraining from making inferences about the nature of the information uncovered (Dempsey, 1996). The process ends when the case is investigated and either suspended or presented to prosecutors for action in a court of law (McDevitt, 2005).

The investigative process serves to determine that sufficient factual evidence of a crime exists, and to legally obtain real, physical evidence of that crime. The police serve to locate leads that enable additional evidence to be revealed, to locate persons or property, to properly store and preserve evidence, and to locate any evidence that may be used to discredit a witness or suspect. The reports and documentation that arise out of the investigative process must be accurately and completely recorded, and must accurately correlate the evidence obtained to the

offense charged. This documentation serves as the basis for any future criminal prosecution (Dempsey, 1996).

The criminal investigation is conducted in two phases. The first phase is the preliminary investigation, in which the patrol officer conducts the investigation and completes the initial report of the crime. This initial report contains information regarding the identity of the victim, the details of the crime, the identity or description of the perpetrator(s), and identifies any property taken during the offense. The second phase is the follow-up investigation, in which the detective uses the information obtained in the initial report to investigate the case. The purpose of the follow-up investigation is either to suspend the case or solve it by arresting the suspect, with the detective bearing responsibility for documenting the final result of the investigation (Dempsey, 1996). The detective relies on training and personal experience in order to know how, when and where to look for evidence that a crime has occurred. The detective also utilizes additional resources such as witnesses and informants with firsthand information about the crime, as well as technology that assists with evidence collection and preservation (Lyman, 1999). The more serious the offense committed, the greater the likelihood that a detective will investigate (Dempsey, 1996).

Research is limited with regard to the criminal investigation process, particularly with regard to how investigators spend their time. The landmark study on investigations, *The Criminal Investigation Process* sponsored by the Rand Corporation, was conducted about 30 years ago and recommended that the patrol officer be given an expanded role in conducting the preliminary investigation (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). Little has changed regarding the view that the patrol officer is effective at investigating crimes that do not require extended time or specialized skills. Investigators spend their time on a variety of tasks, and current literature has

not brought any new information forward regarding how detectives spend time solving cases. The Rand report found that the role of the investigator is not instrumental to solving crimes. This finding was later contradicted by research sponsored by the Police Executive Research Forum, among others, which found that the investigator is an essential part of the process. The current consensus is that patrol officers and detectives have a symbiotic relationship that is essential in solving crimes (Eck, 1984).

The purpose of this current research is to examine the criminal investigation process within the Richardson, Texas Police Department in an effort to assess the impact the patrol officer has in solving crimes in this department. The first part of this study evaluates the frequency with which the patrol officer solves the cases assigned to the investigations division. The second part of this study examines how detectives spend their time, both on case assignments and on other activity. The amount of crime solved by the patrol officer at present is a determining factor in whether or not the patrol officer could be allocated more time to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation of specific cases. A determining factor in whether the detective could be allocated more time to conduct the follow-up investigation rests with reassigning the tasks currently performed by detectives to patrol officers or other staff members. The combination of changes in the time available for preliminary and follow-up investigation improves efficiency which should lead to higher crime clearance rates.

The following two research questions are addressed by this thesis:

- What role do patrol officers play in solving cases assigned to investigations?
- How do detectives spend their time?

Chapter 2 contains the current literature pertinent to each of these research questions. Chapter 3 presents the methodology used to conduct each part of the research study. The first

question is addressed through the analysis of 352 offense reports in order to determine the volume of cases that are solved at the preliminary investigations phase by the patrol officer. The second question is addressed through the evaluation of the detective's time logs in order to determine the amount of time the detective is engaged in solving crime during the follow-up investigation. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter 4, and the results of both questions are discussed in Chapter 5. The discussion centers upon whether patrol officers should be given more autonomy to investigate certain types of cases, and whether certain tasks currently performed by detectives could be performed by other personnel so that more time is available for investigating and clearing more complex cases (Eck, 1992).

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of current literature on the criminal investigation process reveals that more is known about the role of the patrol officer in this process than is known about the investigator's role. The literature review is organized into two main sections: the role of the patrol officer in solving crime, and how detectives spend their time. A discussion of the research, findings and recommendations from the available literature is presented with regard to the role of the patrol officer in solving crime. The literature describes the models for patrol officer involvement in preliminary investigation, and concludes with a review of activities performed during the preliminary investigation. The case screening process is presented, outlining case management practices from the conclusion of the preliminary investigation to the point that the case is assigned for follow-up investigation. A discussion of the research, findings and recommendations from the available literature is presented with regard to how detectives spend their time. The literature describes the caseload impacts to detectives based on the level of patrol officer involvement in the preliminary investigation, and concludes with a review of the activities performed during the follow-up investigation.

#### Question 1: The Patrol Officer's Role in Solving Crime

Patrol officers are the single largest group of employees in the police department, representing about 65% of the total personnel on staff (Reaves & Hickman, 2002). Their time is spent not only on crime control tasks but also on administrative tasks. Crime control tasks include responding to calls for service from citizens, conducting preliminary investigations, making arrests, issuing citations, performing crime inspections, interviewing suspects, and

developing informants. Administrative tasks include such activities as vehicle and equipment maintenance and repairs, or attending community meetings (Adams, 2001). Limits are set on the patrol officer's crime control tasks because of the time required to respond to calls for service within the patrol officer's assigned district (Adams, 2001; McDevitt, 2005).

Police departments must provide service to the community often with limited resources. When crime is discovered by an officer or reported to the police department, the first officer arriving on the scene is usually the patrol officer in whose district the incident occurred (Adams, 2001). It is logical therefore that the first responding patrol officer would be in the best position to gather valuable and timely information about the crime. Assigning a patrol officer to conduct a preliminary investigation maximizes the chances for the case to be closed at, or shortly after, the first contact with the scene (McDevitt, 2005).

The most critical challenge for police agencies is to balance the time required to conduct the preliminary investigation against the calls for service that are continually assigned to patrol officers. Criminal justice researchers have found that there is great value in assigning patrol officers to conduct the preliminary investigation and that police departments would benefit by giving first responding officers more time to perform this task.

#### *Major Studies on the Role the Patrol Officer in Criminal Investigations*

The landmark academic study of criminal investigations was *The Rand Report: The Criminal Investigation Process*, which was conducted in 1975. The empirical knowledge of the investigation process, along with the recommendations of how to conduct an investigation has largely remained unchanged in the thirty years since the Rand report was released. Two additional comprehensive studies of criminal investigations addressing this same issue are the



1983 study sponsored by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) entitled *Solving Crimes: The Investigation of Burglary and Robbery* and the 2001 unpublished study sponsored by the United States Department of Justice entitled *National Survey of Police Practices Regarding the Criminal Investigations Process: Twenty-Five Years after Rand*. Each of these three studies were designed to examine the role of the patrol officer and detective in the investigation process, and to recommend changes in the process in order to increase case clearance rates.

### The Rand Report

The Rand Corporation received a grant from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in the 1970s in order to conduct a national study of the criminal investigation process. The goals of this study were to describe current investigation practices, to assess the contribution of investigation to criminal justice goals, to ascertain the effectiveness of new technology used to enhance investigations, and to assess the overall effectiveness of how the investigation process was organized and managed (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). All municipal and county police agencies employing over 150 sworn officers, or those agencies serving over 100,000 citizens were surveyed, with a focus on police investigation of index crimes such as murder, robbery and rape. In addition, researchers conducted observations and interviews in more than 25 departments, so that different types of investigative methods were included in the evaluation. Case samples were also reviewed in order to determine how specific cases were solved (Greenwood, Chaiken, Petersilia, & Prusoff, 1975; Lyman, 1999).

Greenwood and Petersilia (1975) found that the single most important issue in solving a case was the information supplied by the victim to the first responding patrol officer. If a suspect was not identified during the preliminary investigation this meant that the suspect would most

likely not be identified in the future (Dempsey, 1996). The findings also showed that as many as 80% of the cases cleared by police were the result of arrests at the scene, identification of suspects, or other actions of the first responding officer which directly affected investigative outcomes (Chaiken, Greenwood, & Petersilia, 1976; Horvath & Messig, 2001).

Most agencies provided at least some training on investigations to their patrol officers. Those agencies with a lower percentage of investigators on staff assigned patrol officers a greater role in conducting preliminary investigations than those with a larger complement of investigators (Greenwood, Chaiken, and Petersilia, 1977). For agencies which did assign patrol officers to investigative duties, 58% of these agencies reported that their patrol officers were assigned to limited duties such as securing crime scenes, notifying investigators of the incident, arresting suspects, and preparation of incident reports. The remainder of these agencies (42%) assigned their patrol officers to duties ranging from on-scene activities, to investigating certain crimes like burglaries and misdemeanors, to full investigative responsibility for all reported crimes (Greenwood, Chaiken, & Petersilia, 1977; Horvath & Messig 2001). The study revealed that the majority of agencies did not use their patrol officers to perform expanded investigation activities (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975).

The Rand report provided comprehensive information on the criminal investigation process, however the study faced criticism because of limitations in data collection throughout the study. One of the primary limitations was the limited sample size used for the survey data. The sampling frame included only 300 of the largest agencies, did not include state agencies or more than 15,000 smaller agencies. Only 153 agencies responded to the survey, and of that number only 29 on-site visits were conducted following the completion of the survey. The report generalized its findings too broadly based on the limited sources of information used in the

study, which is another general criticism. A number of the findings were based on data and samples collected during on-site visits to seven or fewer agencies, and some findings based on information from just one agency (Horvath & Messig, 2001). Therefore, broad reliance on the findings of this study was cautioned once the report was published.

#### The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) Study

As a result of the Rand report, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommended in 1983 that written guidelines be established regarding the use of patrol officers in the investigation process, that patrol officers should conduct a thorough preliminary investigation, and that only detectives should be assigned to serious or complex preliminary investigations (Dempsey, 1996). At the same time, research continued on the criminal investigation process.

In 1983, Eck directed a two-year study of 3,360 burglary and 320 robbery investigations in three jurisdictions of DeKalb County, Georgia, St. Petersburg, Florida, and Wichita, Kansas under sponsorship from the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). Official reports, activity logs, and observations were reviewed and cases chosen regardless of whether an arrest had occurred. Researchers documented the entire investigative process, including direct information from patrol officers and detectives about the actions taken, the amount of time spent on these actions, and the information that resulted from these actions. The study covered the entire criminal investigation process from the patrol officer's first response to the conclusion of the detective's activities (Cheurprakobkit, 2003; Eck, 1984).

This study found that the preliminary investigation is important because it is the basis of the leads which are pursued during the follow-up investigation. Of the cases studied,

approximately 75% were suspended in less than two days due to a lack of leads. In most cases the patrol officers interviewed the victim and checked the crime scene, but spent less time interviewing witnesses, collecting evidence, or canvassing neighborhoods (Cheurprakobkit, 2003; Eck, 1984). Researchers also found that in the five years between the Rand report and the Eck study, departments had followed the recommended changes in case management outlined in the Rand report. Traditionally, detectives were assigned cases in rotation and the priority given cases was determined by the detective based on workload. Rand recommended that cases be assigned to investigative teams based on the type of offenses being investigated. A team leader would remain apprised of the progress on cases and make tactical decisions about the effort expended to solve cases (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). This reorganization had an impact on case screening procedures and on the patrol officer being assigned to conduct criminal investigations. The quality of leads developed during the preliminary investigation determined whether the case would reach the detective and whether the case would be quickly suspended or result in a follow-up investigation (Eck, 1984).

#### National Survey of Police Policies and Practices

Since the Eck study, no other comprehensive research on the criminal investigation process has been completed. In 2000, Horvath and Messig conducted a study entitled *The National Survey of Police Policies and Practices Regarding the Criminal Investigations Process: Twenty-Five Years After Rand*. This study was designed in response to the need for a systematic, up to date, and comprehensive description of the police investigation process in the nearly 30 years since Rand. Horvath and Messig (2001) surveyed 18,000 police agencies so that a nationally representative sample of all of the municipal, county, and state agencies in the United

States would be included. The resulting data was linked with other national data resources so that a comparison of agency investigative resources and processes could be made within the context of broader policing functions. Comprehensive information was collected and catalogued regarding police practices, policies, goals and perspectives of the investigation process. Building upon the findings of the Rand report, Horvath and Messig (2001) found that the information obtained at the preliminary investigation was critical in making the decision about whether a follow-up investigation would ever be conducted.

The study found that the two critical issues to the criminal investigation process were the role of the public as the primary source of information to the police and the role of the patrol officer in solving crime. Community policing directives address attention to these two issues through the development of community partnerships that facilitate trust and rapport between the police and the community. Community partnerships increase the flow of useful information coming to the police from the public and provide the patrol officer with access to valuable information that assists in solving and preventing crime. A better relationship between the public and the police is the foundation upon which the criminal investigation process itself rests (Davis, 1998; Horvath & Messig, 2001).

The Rand report found that patrol officers generally did not carry out a wide range of investigative tasks (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). In order to determine if this were still the case, Horvath and Messig (2001) asked agencies if patrol officers were assigned investigative responsibility, and if so how this had been accomplished. Overall, fewer than half of the agencies reported that patrol officers performed investigative tasks such as interview or interrogation of suspects, evidence collection and processing, coordination with prosecutors, or other proactive investigative tasks. This finding agrees with the Rand report, that patrol officers generally do not

perform a full range of investigative tasks. Many agencies reported that the reasons they were trying to enhance the patrol officer's role was to improve the officer's awareness of the investigative process, to improve the quality of reports referred to investigators, and to clear more crimes in a shorter amount of time. Additional reasons cited were to improve relations between patrol officers and detectives, to meet budgetary constraints, to evaluate the work performance of patrol officers, to improve the morale of patrol officers, and to free investigator's time so that major crime investigations could be conducted (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

This finding is important because it confirms that in the almost 30 years since the Rand report was released, police agencies are continuing to struggle with how to increase patrol officer participation in preliminary investigations. Horvath and Messig (2001) found that a majority of agencies (72%) reported efforts to enhance the role of the patrol officer within the past five years, with 83% of that number assigning responsibility for conducting preliminary investigations at the crime scene before referring the case to detectives. Seventy-seven percent of that number reported that their investigators sometimes refer cases back to the patrol officer for follow-up investigation. A majority of agencies (71%) indicated that patrol officers conducted complete follow-up investigations unless the cases were complex. Regardless of the patrol officer's involvement in investigations, most agencies reported that patrol officers were not required to attend investigations classroom training beyond their basic academy training. Additional training was not budgeted for by agencies, and the patrol officers were not evaluated on their investigative abilities.

### *The Preliminary Investigation Process*

A review of the preliminary investigation process aids in understanding the challenges

faced by police departments with regard to patrol officer involvement in criminal investigations. The patrol officer's involvement in the preliminary investigation is a resource allocation strategy that utilizes patrol resources to alleviate the heavy caseloads of investigators, while simultaneously providing higher quality initial information to investigators so that more cases may be solved.

### Patrol Utilization Models

There are two basic models police agencies use to assign patrol officers to investigations. The first is the traditional model, whereby the patrol officer responds to the scene, takes the initial report, performs some degree of cursory investigation, and forwards the case to the investigations division. Detectives would expend effort by responding to crime scenes, re-interviewing victims and witnesses, and searching for leads that could solve the case (Dempsey, 1996). Although limited research has been conducted on the criminal investigation process, research has not been recently conducted which has identified how many agencies currently assign patrol officers to the traditional, limited investigations model (Eck, 1992)

The second is the expanded use of patrol model, whereby patrol officers perform some level of investigative duties depending upon departmental policy. The expanded use of patrol model can be thought of as a continuum, where patrol officers investigate misdemeanors, to a middle ground where patrol officers investigate all misdemeanors and some felonies like larceny and burglary, all the way to the patrol officers investigating all but the most serious or complex cases. This model provides agencies with strategies that enable the detective to have more time available to conduct investigations of complex cases or those cases requiring a greater time commitment or specialized skills (Lyman, 1999).

Some departments have become successful in implementing an expanded use of patrol model that is on the far side of the use of patrol continuum, freeing the patrol officer from calls for service and establishing almost total involvement in all preliminary investigations. An example of this is the Uniformed Crime Investigators (UCI) program, implemented in 1984 at the Oceanside, California Police Department. The goals of this program were to increase productivity and cost-effectiveness in criminal investigations while using existing manpower and equipment with minimal budget impacts. UCIs were responsible for doing everything necessary at the initial call to successfully complete the case, with total control of the incident unless the circumstances were such that detectives or other investigative personnel such as crime scene specialists were needed. Only cases that required extensive follow-up were directed to the Investigations Division (Berry, 1984).

Patrol officers were selected to be UCIs, and were still responsible for regular patrol duties as well as investigative functions as the case required. The department identified four areas which required other experts and follow-up investigation by a detective: homicides; assaults where death was likely to occur; officer-involved shootings; and arson cases. The preliminary investigation performed by UCIs did not result in a suspect identification in most of the cases, but has produced excellent results in connecting perpetrators to a series of crimes. As a result, the greatest impact at the Oceanside Police Department was in the Property Crimes Section of the Investigations Division. UCIs collected a large amount of physical evidence, leading to arrests as a result of the preliminary investigations (Berry, 1984). The UCI program is a rare example of total patrol officer involvement in investigation.

Although the research has recommended expanding the role of patrol officers in the investigation process, the majority of agencies still do not do this. Agencies have begun to assign



their patrol officers to more investigative duties for a wider number of offenses over the past 30 years, although data on the number of offenses is lacking. For example, in some police agencies, patrol officers investigate all misdemeanors, while in other agencies patrol officers handle investigations of felonies such as burglary and larceny. Regardless of the role patrol officers play in investigating cases, detectives have continued to investigate the most serious and complex cases (Eck, 1992).

The greatest challenge to police administrators is how to provide the patrol officer more time to fill an expanded role in criminal investigations. The patrol officer's duties change daily, and time is the reason often given for not assigning the patrol officer more responsibility for preliminary investigation. As calls for service increase, time constraints may keep the patrol officer from spending a great deal of time on investigative tasks. If the patrol officer is to be assigned to investigations, the agency must decide under what circumstances the patrol officer would be responsible for conducting the preliminary investigation (Eck, 1992). This challenge is critical for administrators as future strategies for maximizing clearance rates and minimizing costs are considered.

### Conducting the Preliminary Investigation

Regardless of the depth of involvement the patrol officer may have in the preliminary investigation, there are common activities that occur in every preliminary investigation. Table 1 refers to the tasks patrol officers typically perform during the preliminary investigation. Upon arrival, the situation must be quickly assessed in order to determine what crime, if any, occurred at the scene. The victims, witnesses and suspects must be identified. If there is an imminent threat to life or safety, steps must be taken to apprehend the suspect and reduce or eliminate the

Table 1

*Preliminary Investigation Activities*

Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide aid to any injured persons at the scene, if necessary.</li> <li>• Secure the crime scene so that unauthorized persons cannot enter the scene, and so that evidence is not lost or contaminated.</li> <li>• Check the crime scene for evidence associated with the crime.</li> <li>• Collect and preserve any physical evidence associated with the crime.</li> <li>• Determine the exact nature of the offense committed, if any.</li> <li>• Determine the identity of any suspect(s) and conduct an interview and an arrest, if the arrest can be accomplished at the scene or through immediate pursuit of the suspect(s).</li> <li>• Furnish other police units with information about wanted persons or vehicles, including descriptions, method and direction of flight, or other relevant information.</li> <li>• Identify and interview any victims and witnesses.</li> <li>• Determine whether investigative specialists or other assistance is necessary through discussions with other patrol officers, investigators, and supervisors.</li> <li>• Complete a thorough and accurate report of actions taken during the preliminary investigation.</li> </ul>

*Source:* (Dempsey, 1996; Eck, 1992; McDevitt, 2005)

threat (Adams, 2005). The crime scene itself must be documented and the evidence identified and collected. Securing the crime scene is critical (Lyman, 1999).

The tasks performed during the preliminary investigation vary by the type of crime being investigated. The most common tasks performed are interviewing the victim and checking the crime scene, which is done in over 90% of the cases (Eck, 1992). All other tasks in Table 1 are performed in less than half the cases investigated (Dempsey, 1996; Eck, 1992, McDevitt, 2005). For example, in burglary cases, tasks completed generally involve report taking, interviewing victims, and checking the crime scenes for evidence. Burglaries are normally stealth crimes

where perpetrators avoid detection by victims and witnesses, leaving officers little evidence on which to base the investigation. As a result, patrol officers do not often search for and talk to witnesses, talk to informants or interview suspects in these types of cases. On the other hand, robberies require different investigation tactics because this crime requires the interaction of the victim and offender. Patrol officers are more likely to interview witnesses in a robbery investigation, and are more likely to discuss the case with supervisors, detectives and other patrol officers (Eck, 1992).

Horvath and Messig (2001) asked agencies to indicate the tasks uniformed officers performed from a list of thirteen specific tasks, and the results are found in Table 2. Their findings verify that patrol officer involvement in preliminary investigation activities remain limited in a majority of police agencies. For those agencies reporting that patrol officers were involved in conducting preliminary investigations, a majority of agencies reported that patrol officer's responsibilities included securing crime scenes, notifying investigations units of the progress of their investigations, conducting records checks, interviewing victims and witnesses, and canvassing the area for potential witnesses. In less than one-half of the agencies responding, patrol officers were responsible for interviewing suspects, conducting drug field tests, collecting physical evidence from suspects and crime scenes, interrogating suspects, submitting evidence for analysis, coordinating investigations with prosecutors, conducting surveillance, and conducting undercover activities.

Table 2

*Frequency of Tasks Performed During Preliminary Investigation*

Tasks Performed	Agencies Responding
Secure the crime scene	91%
Notify investigations unit of progress of patrol investigation	73%
Conduct records check	69%
Interview victims and witnesses	64%
Canvass the area for potential witnesses	64%
Interview suspect(s)	47%
Conduct drug field test	44%
Collect physical evidence from suspect(s) and crime scene(s)	42%
Interrogate suspect(s)	41%
Submit evidence for analysis	40%
Coordinate investigations with prosecutors	25%
Conduct surveillance	20%
Conduct undercover activities	8%

*Source:* (Horvath & Messig, 2001)

It is an advantage to use patrol officers to conduct the preliminary investigation because it leads to more efficient use of the detective's valuable time that would otherwise be spent investigating routine cases. If the patrol officer conducts an effective preliminary investigation, the associated follow-up investigation can often be very limited or may not need to be conducted at all, allowing detectives to spend their time on only those investigations that require their specific expertise. The patrol officer benefits because the involvement in investigations provides him or her with expanded experience, maximizes the on-the-job training received, and increases the benefit that the officer brings to the agency. Agencies with skilled patrol officers are able to

have a larger roster of officers to consider for future assignments, especially in those agencies which select new detectives from the patrol division. Perhaps the most important advantage to an agency is that the patrol officer's morale is greatly improved due to increased involvement in the investigation process. The patrol officer feels more like a part of the department, can demonstrate individual investigative skills and abilities, and can participate in the process of solving crime (McDevitt, 2005). Regardless of the level of patrol officer involvement in the preliminary investigation, there are certain situations in which the preliminary investigation must be conducted by a detective rather than a patrol officer. Examples include continuing investigations, investigations that would take the officer out of his jurisdiction, or investigations involving undercover work over a period time, such as narcotics or vice cases (Adams, 2001). Other cases, such as homicides, missing persons, and gang-related cases require the expertise of a detective to investigate the leads that may identify a suspect (Skolnick & Bayley, 1986). The patrol officer notifies his or her supervisor in these situations, and the case is referred to the detective who is responsible for conducting the preliminary and follow-up investigations.

### The Initial Report

The first responding patrol officer completes an initial report for every call for service, documenting his or her involvement in the case. The initial report is the summation of the preliminary investigation conducted by the patrol officer, no matter how extensive, which is forwarded to the investigations division for following up. The quality of the information contained in the report is a key element as to how many cases get solved and how quickly. There are proportionally more patrol officers in a police department than there are detectives. As a

result, the more cases that are solved at patrol means higher clearance rates, and less time and money spent by detectives on follow-up investigations.

The police report is the result of any criminal investigation, and is the permanent record of the complaint and the facts of the case leading up to arrest of the suspect. The organization of the report is critical in enabling the reader to learn pertinent information quickly. The report is divided into two parts, the initial report which contains the facts of the preliminary investigation, and the supplemental report which is completed by the detective and contains the facts of the follow-up investigation (Lyman, 1999). Many officers write reports that are not well prepared, which makes interpretation of the facts difficult for those involved in the follow-up investigation and prosecution of the case. More importantly, the defense attorney can use a poorly written report during trial to confuse the officer's account of what occurred at the scene and possibly result in an otherwise guilty suspect being acquitted of the charges (Lyman, 1999).

Departmental policy determines how the police report is organized. The report typically includes the date of the offense and the type of crime, which is generally designated by unit such as crimes against property, crimes against persons, vice and narcotics, and so forth. The crimes are further categorized by the specific offense such as robbery, burglary, or aggravated assault. The case is assigned a case number by the records division, which is used on all reports filed in the investigation. The officer's full name, rank and badge number are listed along with the officer's jurisdiction. The suspect's full name, along with any aliases, address, date of birth, and any other relevant information known about the suspect is included. The victim's name and address are included, along with the name and address of any witnesses to the crime. A brief summary of the general details of the crime is included, which is usually a paragraph in length (Lyman, 1999).

A fact sheet, which contains an at-a-glance summary of the investigation including the suspect's name and identifiers, is included with the initial report. A summary of the facts is included, specifying information such as times, dates, locations, activities of those involved, and the evidence collected by the officer. This fact sheet is the first information seen by anyone reviewing the case file, so it is important to keep the information specific and to the point (Lyman, 1999).

Additionally, the initial report includes a complete description of the details of the crime scene at the time the patrol officer first arrived including who the officer encountered at the scene, any injuries to the victim or the suspect, any weapons used, and the specific actions the officer performed while at the scene. The patrol officer indicates whether first aid was administered, whether his or her immediate supervisor was consulted at any time during the incident. Further, the report details the names and identifiers for all suspects arrested, and the names of all witnesses along with copies of any witness statements. The report includes a list of all the evidence encountered at the scene and details concerning the chain of custody of the evidence. Chain of custody information includes how the evidence was collected, who handled the evidence, how and where the evidence was stored, and who currently has possession of the evidence such as the crime lab (Lyman, 1999).

Once the initial report is completed, the patrol officer's role in the case is concluded. The exception to this is when the patrol officer testifies in court about his or her involvement in the case. Studies have shown that some agencies may reassign cases to patrol for some follow-up investigation, although most do not. Once the report is completed, the case is sent to the investigations division for processing and assignment to follow-up investigation (Lyman, 1999).

### *The Case Screening Process*

In the aftermath of the Rand report and other scientific studies, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) funded research that led to the publication of managing criminal investigations (MCI) proposal, regarding the methods that should be used to manage criminal investigations. These methods included the use of solvability factors, case screening procedures, and coordination between police and prosecutors (Dempsey, 1996). Case management procedures vary between agencies, and are usually based on the level of patrol officer involvement in the preliminary investigation. Case management is relatively easy to accomplish in those agencies where patrol officers have a limited role in investigations, as the referral procedure is exactly the same for every case. The patrol officer responds to the scene, completes a basic incident report and forwards the case to detectives for preliminary investigation. It is more difficult and time consuming for the detective to conduct the investigation because of the limited information gathered at the time of the incident. Witnesses are often reluctant to talk with police at the scene, and may be increasingly reluctant to cooperate if the witnesses must wait for an investigator to arrive (McDevitt, 2005).

Case management is more complex in those agencies where patrol officers actively participate in the investigation process. Procedures are established which define the types of cases a patrol officer may investigate, at both the preliminary and follow-up investigation stages, as well as the resulting role of the detective in the process. Case screening factors, or solvability factors, are defined based on the work completed at the patrol level. The patrol officer, upon completion of the preliminary investigation, consults with the case supervisor regarding whether the case should be closed at the scene or referred to investigations for follow up. Cases that are



referred for follow-up investigation are handled first by the case screening detective at the completion of the preliminary investigation (McDevitt, 2005).

The case screening detective is responsible for evaluating the initial report and making a determination as to whether follow-up investigation will be performed, or the case will be suspended. If the case is deemed solvable, it is then assigned for follow-up investigation. If the case is not solvable, the case is suspended and no further investigative effort is expended. Greenwood and Petersilia (1975) found that some agencies use solvability factors to determine if a case should be followed up by the detective or suspended until more leads arise. Usually, a case is assigned to a detective and some cursory follow-up investigation is performed, usually in the form of re-interviewing the victim or witness. Horvath and Messig (2001) found that while 50% of agencies responding to the survey reported the use of case solvability factors to screen cases, these factors were used as guidelines to facilitate decision making, rather than as rigid criteria for handling cases. Eighty-three percent of agencies reported that solvability factors were applied to all types of cases, regardless of the offenses involved.

Police administrators developed different methods for reducing the number of follow-up investigations by screening out cases where the preliminary investigation failed to provide sufficient information for a case to be solved. Many departments assign clearance factors to cases which indicate the work completed on the case, such as whether the suspect has been identified or forensic evidence exists that links the suspect to the crime. The factors used are part of the departmental case screening policy, and assist the case manager in deciding whether the investigation will be closed or assigned to a detective for following up (Eck, 1992).

Those cases requiring extensive follow-up, a high level of care, or are of an exceptional nature are referred to detectives based on previous patterns of offenses or individual workloads

(Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975; McDevitt, 2005). Each detective will usually receive one or two new cases each day. Workload assignments for crimes against persons are lower, and are higher for minor property crimes (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). Grouping these factors enable case managers to identify those cases that appear unable to be solved. These cases are not usually assigned to detectives for follow-up investigation unless there are other reasons to do so, such as the seriousness of the crime or if it is a high profile case (McDevitt, 2005).

Police departments are continually looking for ways to improve the investigation process and sometimes conduct studies of staffing levels to determine changes that are necessary to improve efficiency. For example, in 2005 the Springfield, Massachusetts Police Department published the results of a staffing study reviewing among other things the effectiveness of patrol and investigations. The report revealed that the department had no formalized case management systems for criminal investigations, although a previous study conducted in 1993 had recommended this change. As a result, one supervisor with responsibility for more than 50 detectives could not easily tell how many detectives were working without the use of a manual log book to determine case assignments. The study also stated that the Springfield department did not use solvability factors to determine assignments to investigators. The study called this management process “archaic,” and recommended the development of a formal solvability factors program, or case screening procedures, to assist in decision making regarding the investigation of some crimes (Buracker, 2005). As the Springfield study shows, it is important to manage the criminal investigation process. Improper or absent administrative control over the investigative process leads to problems such as inequitable caseload assignments among detectives, improper assignment of cases for follow-up investigation, incorrect prioritization of cases, and lack of continuity in the investigation process (McDevitt, 2005).

## Question 2: The Investigator's Activities

Police departments consider a case cleared, or solved, when an arrest is made or when the case is suspended for some other reason, such as insufficient evidence or lack of victim cooperation. Not all crimes are reported to the police department, and of the crimes that are reported not all are cleared by arrest. In 2005, 47% of all violent crimes and 40% of all property crimes were reported to the police. Violent crimes include serious offenses such as murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Property crimes include such offenses as burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft (Catalano, 2006). Of the crimes reported to police in 2005, almost half (45.5%) of the violent crimes and 16.3% of property crimes were cleared by arrest (Crime in the United States, 2005). There is little empirical knowledge about the investigation process which accounts for these case clearance results. Much of the research about how crime is solved and who solves it is outdated and limited (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

Based upon what is known about the process, police administrators are able to make the following generalizations about investigations. First, the single most important factor in whether a crime is solved is found in the information the victim supplies to the first officer who responds to the scene of the crime. Secondly, detectives can be more effective in solving crimes (Dempsey, 1996). Early studies such as the Rand report challenged the usefulness of detective work, which sparked a lot of controversy in the law enforcement community. In response to this controversy, some police investigators reviewed the investigative function and found ways to make detectives more effective in solving crimes (Stewart, 1984).

The detective is a specialist who performs tasks primarily related to law enforcement (Lyman, 1999), and may operate in a centralized or decentralized organization. In a decentralized system, detectives are generalists located in a local detective unit within each precinct and

responsible for investigating all crimes across the specific precinct. In a centralized system, detectives are specialists located in one central office and responsible for investigating a specific type of crime across the entire jurisdiction (Dempsey, 1996).

There is little empirical research to describe what detectives do during the follow-up investigation, but research has, for the most part, demonstrated that detectives follow standard police procedures to solve crimes (Eck, 1992). Investigations units comprise approximately 16% of all full-time sworn personnel in a typical police agency (Reaves & Hickman, 2002).

Detectives are vital to the investigative function because they are almost exclusively tasked with conducting criminal investigations or activities related to criminal investigations, whereas patrol officers are responsible for activities other than preliminary investigations (Eck, 1992). A challenge for police agencies is to offset the detective's case workload by providing additional time for the patrol officer to conduct a more thorough preliminary investigation, based upon the patrol utilization model in place in the department.

#### *Major Studies on the Role of the Detective in Criminal Investigations*

Little research has been completed with regard to how investigators spend their time. The three comprehensive research studies on the criminal investigation process are *The Rand Report: The Criminal Investigation Process*, conducted in the 1970s, *Solving Crimes: The Investigation of Burglary and Robbery*, (1983), and the *National Survey of Police Practices Regarding the Criminal Investigations Process: Twenty-Five Years after Rand* (2001) Each of these studies examined the role of the detective in the investigation process, and recommend changes in the way work was performed by detectives during the follow-up investigation.

## The Rand Report

At the time the Rand report was published, the majority of police departments followed the traditional model for the use of patrol. This meant that most cases were forwarded to the investigations division for processing, and patrol had little role in the investigative process. Researchers found that 93% of a detective's time was spent on reviewing reports, documenting files, and attempting to locate witnesses or victims on cases that had a reduced chance of being cleared. These cases were usually cleared because the identity of the suspect was already known or easily obtained from the information supplied by the first responding officer, rather than because of the specialized skills of a trained investigator (Chaiken, Greenwood, and Petersilia, 1976; Greenwood, and Petersilia, 1975), even when the case cleared after the initial report failed to identify the suspect (Dempsey, 1996; Horvath & Messig, 2001).

Researchers recommended that departments should change the investigative process so that properly trained patrol officers conduct the preliminary investigation (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975; Horvath & Messig, 2001). Redundancy would be reduced and clearance rates improved by closing many cases at the preliminary investigation stage rather than passing the case to detectives without a thorough preliminary investigation. Detectives would be able to screen cases more effectively by creating a distinction between cases requiring routine clerical processing and those requiring specialized investigations (Lyman, 1999).

The Rand report concluded that the detective's expertise had a marginal impact on solving cases and recommended that half of all detectives could be eliminated from the investigations unit and placed in more productive positions by organizing departments according to types of investigations, creating strike-forces, and eliminating follow-up investigation for all but the most serious cases (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). Greenwood and Petersilia (1975)

concluded that case clearance was largely a result of routine processing of information gathered from the first responding officer, rather than a result of the use of investigative teams with specialized skills. This lack of specialization resulted in the detective not contributing greatly to overall arrest and clearance rates (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975; Horvath & Messig, 2001).

The study found that detectives established priorities for cases, with the highest priority reserved for those where the focus of the investigation necessary was obvious from the information in the initial report. The next priority was given to cases that were serious or high profile. The lowest priority was given to those cases without leads, which received no more than cursory attention (Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975). Researchers recommended that for those cases requiring routine processing in order to be cleared. Detectives should not perform these tasks because they are paid more than patrol officers or clerks. Less expensive personnel could more efficiently perform these functions. Once clerical processing is completed, if further action is required by a sworn officer, the case should then be assigned to detectives (Chaiken, Greenwood & Petersilia, 1976).

#### The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) Study

This research documented the specific actions taken by detectives and the information gathered during follow-up investigations. The findings of this study contradicted the Rand report with regard to the productivity of detectives by concluding that detectives and patrol officers contributed equally to the resolution of these cases. In one quarter of cases, detectives played a major role in the follow-up work conducted to identify and arrest suspects (Eck, 1984; Lyman, 1999). The study further found that for cases where the suspect was not identified during the

preliminary investigation, detectives identified a suspect in about 14% of those cases and made an arrest in almost 8% of those cases (Eck, 1984).

The cases involved in this study required short investigations with changing focus. Eck (1984) found that most burglary and robbery cases were investigated for about four hours, from preliminary investigation to follow-up investigation. The time span for the investigations ranged from three to eleven days, from the initial crime report to the suspension of the case. The focus of the investigation during the screening process, initial investigation and early stages of follow-up focused on the crime victim and information obtained from the details of the crime, which are outside of the police department's control (Cheurprakobkit, 2003). Eck (1984) found detectives relied upon information from the victim too much, and that information from the victim was less likely to lead to the suspect's arrest. Four other sources of information (witnesses, informants, other officers, and departmental records) were consulted by detectives less often during an investigation, but when consulted were more likely to provide information useful to the investigation (Cheurprakobkit, 2003; Eck, 1984).

The Rand report pronouncement that detectives had a minor impact on clearance and arrest rates was controversial, and later research showed that even though the quality of the preliminary investigation was the key as to whether a follow-up investigation would be successful, detective work was the most accurate predictor of an arrest during the follow-up investigation (Eck, 1984). Several studies such as Eck (1983), Horvath and Messig (1998), Sanders (1977) and Willman and Snortum (1984) reported that detectives "play critical roles in routine case resolutions and post-arrest activities, and that many of their duties require highly specialized skills" (Horvath & Messig, 2001, p. 13).

## Limitations of the Rand and PERF Research Studies

Reliance on the findings of the Rand report is cautioned due to the limitations of the study. The sample used to conduct the study was not a nationally representative sample. In some instances, the results were based upon findings from seven or fewer agencies and over-generalized to the population of police agencies (Horvath & Messig, 2001). It is important to understand the limitations of research such as the Rand report, which concluded that the cases cleared by detectives were for the most part the easy cases to solve. Brandl and Frank (1994) examined the methods used to arrive at this conclusion and found several validity issues with this conclusion. The Rand report relied upon whether a case was cleared as a primary outcome variable without specifying the definition of a cleared case. For example, a case that is cleared by arrest is solved; a case cleared by exception or other means is closed without the crime being solved. Brandl and Frank (1994) concluded that it was more accurate to use the criteria of whether or not at least one arrest was made as an indicator of investigative success because this focused more on the work performed by detectives rather than administrative procedures.

Brandl and Frank (1994) also found that both the Rand report and the Eck study used arrest as an outcome without stating clearly that there were situations where a detective would not be able to make an arrest even when the suspect's identity was known. For example, arrest decisions are affected by situations such as a victim's unwillingness to press charges, or a detective uncovering proof that the reported crime did not occur. Much of the previous research suggested that identification of the suspect during preliminary investigation determined the ultimate disposition of the case. However, this research did not specify the manner in which the suspect was identified, whether by name or by description. This omission may lead to erroneous conclusions. A suspect may be known to the victim by name, or may be generally described by



an eyewitness to the crime, and there was clearly a difference in the strength of this information. Thus it was necessary to provide the basis of the information in order to determine the strength of available suspect information (Brandl & Frank, 1994).

#### National Survey of Police Policies and Practices

Similar to the findings of the PERF study, this research found that the majority of crimes were cleared by on-scene arrests, the initial identification of suspects, and other routine actions of patrol officers, rather than by the follow-up activities of investigators. This finding did not diminish the importance of the detective in solving crime, but pointed out that the quality of investigations appeared to suffer when resources were limited. Although the investigation process had shown some advances, overall it seemed to be relatively unchanged by significant improvements in policing, in the crime problem, and in the technological advances made over the past thirty years (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

The study found that although some departments had adopted the expanded use of patrol model, the role of the detective had been relatively unchanged as a result. Those agencies that continued to use the traditional model for patrol utilization tended to focus on internal changes such as caseload reassignment or organizational restructuring rather than on strategy changes in how investigations were conducted when attempting to improve the investigations function (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

Investigator training was cited as a challenge to police agencies, with personnel shortages, technology changes and improvements in evidence process driving the need for more training. About one-third, or 32%, of agencies reported inadequate access to training for investigators, with lack of funding and personnel shortages driving this shortfall. Slightly more

than one-third, or 39%, of the agencies reported that newly appointed investigators attended some type of training, usually less than two weeks in duration. A small majority of the agencies responding (59%) reported that investigators were required to undergo some type of annual advanced training or refresher courses as part of their job responsibilities. Eighty-four percent of agencies with investigators relied on funding from department budgets to support investigator training, but only 42% had a specific budget for this type of training (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

### *The Follow-Up Investigation Process*

A review of the follow-up investigation process aids in understanding the challenges faced by police departments with regard to how detectives spend their time during criminal investigations. The manner in which patrol is utilized in an agency will determine the impact on the investigations division. Agencies organized according to the traditional patrol model assign higher caseloads to detectives, while those organized according to the expanded use of patrol model assign fewer cases for follow up. Regardless of how much investigation work is handled at patrol, there are common activities that detectives perform during the follow-up investigation.

In most police agencies in the United States, the detective is the highest ranking member of the department present at the crime scene. Once the detective is notified that a *serious* crime has occurred and reports to the scene, he or she assumes control of the crime scene from the patrol officer. The investigator makes key decisions regarding crime scene processing and the investigation of the crime. The detective first interviews the patrol officer, reviews the conditions of the scene at the time the officer arrived and gathers information from the first officer about possible witnesses and suspects who may still be at the scene. The detective ensures that the first officer has documented all of the actions taken at the scene, as this documentation plays a critical

role in the later investigation and prosecution of the case. The detective ensures that the scene is cleared of all unauthorized persons by having all complainants, witnesses and suspects removed from the scene and brought to the police department for interviewing and processing (Dempsey, 1996).

Tasks that are traditionally performed by the detective during the follow-up investigation include re-interviewing the victim and any witnesses, collecting evidence and processing the crime scene, canvassing the immediate area around the crime for witnesses, interrogating possible suspects, arresting alleged perpetrators, and working with the prosecutor to prepare the case for presentation in court (Dempsey, 1996). Patrol officers may also perform these same duties during the preliminary investigation, depending upon the departmental policy governing the use of patrol. In addition to performing investigative duties, the detective must also be familiar with the department's computer and manual records in order to access information such as mug shots, fingerprints, intelligence, and stolen property files. The detective must also be able to follow up on leads using many different methods and processes such as visiting pawn shops, locations suspected or known to fence stolen property, taverns, and any other places suspected to be frequented by criminals (Lyman, 1999). Table 3 refers to the typical tasks the detective performs during the follow-up investigation.

The most common task detectives perform during the follow-up investigation is the victim interview. None of the other activities are common, which indicates that the activities performed vary from offense to offense depending on the nature of the leads and information developed during the preliminary investigation. For example, detectives perform similar tasks when investigating robberies and burglaries, although robbery cases require more investigative time and in-depth follow-up investigations than do burglary cases. This result suggests that patrol

officers could be assigned the responsibility for the investigation of burglaries and larceny without further referral to the investigative unit (Eck, 1992).

Table 3

*Follow-Up Investigation Activities*

Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conduct in-depth interviews of all victims and/or witnesses.</li><li>• Search for witnesses/canvass immediate area around the crime scene for witnesses.</li><li>• Identify, interview/interrogate and apprehend any possible suspect(s).</li><li>• Interview informants and conduct stakeouts as necessary to investigate the crime.</li><li>• Arrest alleged perpetrator(s).</li><li>• Discuss the case with other patrol officers, investigators, and supervisors.</li><li>• Determine whether the suspect/perpetrator is involved in any additional crimes.</li><li>• Arrange for the collection, analysis, preservation and evaluation of evidence.</li><li>• Search for and recover any stolen property.</li><li>• Check police records, computer files and other records.</li><li>• Follow up on leads.</li><li>• Record information obtained in a supplemental report.</li><li>• Work with prosecutor to prepare case for court.</li></ul>

*Source:* (Eck, 1992; McDevitt, 2005)

In order to understand how detectives spend their time, Horvath and Messig (2001) asked agencies to indicate how often their detectives performed 15 different investigative tasks. The results are found in Table 4. These activities did not include core investigative tasks such as interview/interrogation, court testimony and record checks that all detectives were expected to perform. Instead, the activities studied were those most likely to be affected by changes in policing, and divided into three categories – investigative tasks, community-related activity, and

activities with uniformed officers. Agencies were asked to indicate the extent to which each activity was performed by investigators in their departments.

Table 4

*Frequency of Tasks Performed during Follow-Up Investigation*

Tasks		Agencies Responding
Investigative Tasks	Process crime scene for physical evidence	69%
	Prioritize cases based on local area problems	67%
	Self assign cases based on local problems	33%
	Participate in community problem solving	28%
	Conduct undercover investigations	26%
	Work in pairs with other detectives	23%
Community-Related Activity	Receive at least 8 hours of community police training	51%
	Provide crime information to the public	41%
	Regularly participate in community meetings	23%
	Work with citizens on community outreach	10%
	Use citizen volunteers to assist in investigations	7%
	Work in teams with citizen groups	5%
Activities With Uniformed Officers	Work with patrol officers to analyze crime patterns	23%
	Work with patrol officers in decoy units, stakeouts, etc.	12%
	Work in teams with patrol officers	9%

Source: (Horvath & Messig, 2001)

The involvement of the investigator in processing crime scenes was not further examined during the study. Even though crime scene specialists may be employed to perform this task, a majority of the agencies reported their investigators were involved in this task to some extent.

This question was not further explored in the study, even though researchers were curious as to why the detectives in the remaining one-third of agencies did not perform this task. Only two of these investigative tasks were performed by detectives in a majority of the agencies responding. A majority of the agencies reported that investigators performed the task of prioritizing cases based on local problems. One-third or fewer of the agencies responding stated that their investigators regularly performed the remaining tasks in the investigative tasks group. Other than working in pairs, the other tasks may be regarded as proactive in nature, requiring more effort than a traditional follow-up investigation. This suggested that the investigation process for the majority of agencies was mainly reactive, and that few agencies were regularly engaged in proactive investigation (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

Only one community-related activity was performed by detectives in a majority of the agencies responding. Other than training on community policing, none of the tasks listed were regularly performed by a majority of agencies. This indicated that at least some agencies were involving investigators in community policing activities, but this trend fell behind other agencies that were moving toward implementation of community policing tactics and activities (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

With regard to investigators performing activities with uniformed officers, investigators and patrol officers performed these three tasks together in less than one-fourth of the agencies reporting. The relationship between patrol officers and detectives was dynamic and symbiotic, and preliminary investigation outcomes can have significant impacts on the outcome of follow-up investigations. The study results did not make it clear whether enhancing the role of the patrol officer affected the investigators relationship with patrol. The data can either show that agencies

did not consider further integration of patrol and investigations to be useful, or that the tasks in this group did not adequately reflect other role changes (Horvath & Messig, 2001).

### Summary

The literature revealed that the information gathered at the preliminary investigation is essential to case clearance, and that police agencies would benefit from providing more time for first responding patrol officers to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation. The Rand report outlined this recommendation in the 1970s, although the findings of Horvath and Messig (2001) found that the majority of agencies continued to utilize patrol officers in a traditional model. This model relegates patrol officers to the role of responding to the call for service, taking the initial report and forwarding that report to the investigations division for follow-up investigation. Many agencies have adopted an expanded use of patrol model, allowing patrol officers to conduct some level of investigation at the point of first response. The critical challenge for police agencies is how to balance the desire to provide this additional time for patrol officers to conduct the preliminary investigation with maintaining or improving the patrol officer's response to calls for service.

Case management is essential for agencies to balance case workloads for the investigations division, suspending those cases with no chance of being solved and assigning the remainder for follow-up investigation. Agencies that employ the traditional model of patrol utilization assign more cases to investigations than do the agencies utilizing the expanded use of patrol model. Case solvability factors assist the case manager in making these decisions.

Research is limited with regard to how detectives spend their time investigating cases. Detectives are required to spend more time on routine case processing when patrol officers spend

less time conducting the preliminary investigation. Detectives are the highest level of sworn officer assigned to case investigation, and are paid more than patrol officers or clerks. Therefore, it is reasonable that these highly skilled officers should spend less time investigating cases that are not complex or high profile. The involvement of the patrol officer in the preliminary investigation improves the quality of the information available to detectives, and maximizes the chance that the case will be solved.



## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this two-part study of criminal investigations in the Richardson, Texas Police Department is to determine the overall impact of the patrol officer in solving crime. Prior research has verified the critical nature and value of the information obtained by the first responding patrol officer to the overall effectiveness of the police in solving crime. The Richardson Police Department is interested in reviewing their investigation process to establish whether some cases should remain at the patrol level for investigation. In order to make this decision, two research questions must be addressed:

- What role do patrol officers play in solving cases assigned to investigations?
- How do detectives spend their time?

Question 1 is addressed through an examination of how often patrol officers clear a case that has been assigned to the investigations division. This question can be answered by reviewing offense reports assigned to the investigations unit and assessing the patrol officer's involvement in solving the case. For those cases where an arrest has not occurred, an assessment of the patrol officer's level of involvement in solving the case is necessary. This review will assist in determining the effectiveness of the patrol officer in the preliminary investigation phase, and may serve to identify the types of crimes that are suited for investigation by the patrol officer.

Question 2 is addressed through an evaluation of how detectives spend their time. This question can be answered by capturing the amount of time detectives spend on case related activities as well as on other activities not related to case investigation. This review will determine the amount of time detectives engaged follow-up investigation, and whether some functions performed can be shifted from detectives to patrol officers or other personnel in the

department. This shift in responsibility may serve to enable detectives to concentrate on conducting complex case investigations in a more thorough and efficient manner.

### The Richardson Police Department

Richardson is a suburb located north of Dallas, Texas with a population in the year 2000 of 91,635 (US Census Bureau, 2001). The department consists of 144 sworn officers and 21 civilian personnel within the Patrol Division, Investigations Operations Division, and Special Operations Division. The officers in the patrol division are the first response unit for calls for service and traffic management, and are also responsible for various secondary assignments such as accident investigation, bike patrol, field training, recruiting, instructor, mobile field force, honor guard, and special weapons and tactics (SWAT).

The Investigations Operations Division is responsible for investigating criminal cases for the department. Responsibilities of this division include processing information, solving crimes, arresting offenders, developing evidence, recovering stolen property, and building cases for presentation in court proceedings. Some of the units contained within the Investigations Operations Division are Crimes Against Persons, Fraud, and Sector Crimes, the units directly responsible for investigating criminal cases. The Crimes Against Persons Unit is responsible for investigating criminal cases involving assault, family violence, robbery, sex offenses, harassment, or death. The Fraud Unit is responsible for investigating criminal cases involving forged checks, credit card or debit card abuse, and identity theft. The Sector Crimes Unit is responsible for the investigation of all criminal offenses involving burglaries, theft, criminal trespass and juvenile offenders.

## The Current Process for Case Management

The Richardson Police Department most closely follows the traditional model for the use of patrol officers. When a crime occurs, the patrol officer is dispatched to respond. The patrol officer takes appropriate action for the offense at hand and prepares the initial police report. If crime scene technicians were called to the scene, they prepare a supplemental report that will later be included as part of the offense report. The patrol officer's initial report is forwarded to the Investigations Division, for assigning to the unit responsible for investigating the case. The sergeant screens the initial report to determine whether the case will be investigated further, and, if so, the case is forwarded to the appropriate unit that will be assigned the follow-up investigation. The detective investigates the offense, and takes the appropriate action to clear the case or suspend it, meaning that no further investigation of the case occurs.

### Question 1: Patrol Officer's Impact on Solving Crime

#### *The Cases Selected*

The first phase of this research study was to identify the patrol officer's involvement in solving cases. To determine the magnitude of this involvement, it was necessary to review the investigative case files and code pertinent information from each file. A review of every case file would be cumbersome and time-consuming, therefore a sample of case files was selected for review. The investigations division case file database maintained by the Richardson Police Department was obtained in order to obtain a sample of cases to review.

Two selection parameters were applied to the case files in the department database to determine those eligible to be included in the sample. First, the status of the cases selected had to be such that the suspect was either arrested or the case was exceptionally cleared. The study was

only interested in the patrol officer's involvement in solving cases assigned to investigations, and both of these dispositions met that requirement. Those cases which did not lead to an arrest or were not exceptionally cleared were not needed for this study. Cases with a status code of active, inactive, information, pending, reassign, and unfounded were not included in this study.

The second selection parameter used was that the case had to be assigned to the investigations division of the Richardson Police Department in 2004. All cases assigned to the case review detective, rather than a detective in the investigations division, were deleted from the database before the sample was drawn. The case review detective is responsible for analyzing the initial case reports received from the patrol division and making the determination of whether the case will be suspended, or forwarded to the investigations unit for follow-up investigation. The remaining cases available for inclusion in the sample of cases were those assigned to a detective for follow-up investigation. The data were sorted based on these two criteria and all cases which did not meet both criteria were deleted from the database. After this process was completed, 2,367 cases were eligible for inclusion in the final sample.

The 2,367 cases were sorted by incident-based reporting (IBR) code and offense description, and a random sample of cases was drawn. This was done to ensure that the sample selected would represent all of the offenses encountered by the patrol officer. A systematic sampling method was used to select cases based on the number of cases in each category, as shown in Table 5. All cases that rarely occur (five or less in 2004) such as murder, kidnapping, and forcible sodomy were included in the sample. However, only 5% of the cases that frequently occur, such as drug violations, were included in the sample. Based on the selection criteria established for this study, 352 cases were selected for inclusion in the sample. For a complete breakdown of case selection for each IBR code, refer to Table 6.

Table 5

*Systemic Sampling Protocol*

Number of Cases	Percentage of Cases Selected
1-5 Cases	100%
6-19 Cases	50%
20-74 Cases	25%
75-149 Cases	10%
150+ Cases	5%

Table 6

*Sample Selected by IBR Code*

IBR Code	Offense	Total Cases (2004)	Percent Taken	Sample Size
09A	Murder and Non-Negligent Manslaughter	1	100	1
100	Kidnapping/Abduction	2	100	2
11A	Forcible Rape	7	50	4
11B	Forcible Sodomy	3	100	3
11C	Sexual Assault with an Object	7	50	4
11D	Forcible Fondling	12	50	6
120	Robbery	19	50	10
13A	Aggravated Assault	67	25	17
13B	Simple Assault	353	5	18
13C	Intimidation	33	25	9
220	Burglary/Breaking and Entering	82	10	9
23B	Purse Snatching	1	100	1
23C	Shoplifting	120	10	12
23D	Theft from Buildings	56	25	14
23E	Theft from Coin-Operated Machine or Device	3	100	3
23F	Theft from Motor Vehicle	44	25	11
23G	Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories	51	25	13
23H	All Other Larceny	30	25	8

*(continued)*

Table 6 (*continued*).

IBR Code	Offense	Total Cases (2004)	Percent Taken	Sample Size
240	Motor Vehicle Theft	48	25	12
250	Forgery/Counterfeiting	102	10	11
26A	False Pretense/Swindle/Confidence Game	35	25	9
26B	Fraud Credit Card/Automated Teller Machines	23	25	6
26C	Impersonation	39	25	10
270	Embezzlement	23	25	6
280	Stolen Property Offenses (Receiving, etc.)	113	10	12
290	Destructive/Damage/Vandalism of Property	109	10	11
35A	Drug Possession	362	5	19
35B	Drug Equipment Violations	51	25	13
36B	Statutory Rape	5	100	5
39B	Operating/Promoting/Assisting Gambling	1	100	1
520	Weapon Law Violations	46	25	12
90B	Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations	14	50	7
90C	Abuse Language/Noise/Misconduct	95	10	9
90D	Driving Under the Influence	22	25	6
90E	Drunkenness	12	50	6
90F	Family Offenses, Non Violent	13	50	7
90G	Consumption of Alcohol Minor/Open Container	29	25	8
90I	Runaway	55	25	14
90J	Trespass of Real Property	41	25	11
90Z	Evade Arrest/Suspicious Person/FLID-FUG	238	5	12
TOTAL		2367		352

### *Assignment of Clearance Factors*

The Richardson Police Department provided 313 case files, and within these case files 352 separate offenses were described. The numbers are different because some of the cases in the sample included multiple offenses charged under one case number. A single offense was treated as a single case for the purposes of this study. In order to assess the patrol officer's impact in

solving crime, each case file was read and reviewed by up to four analysts to assure consistency in assessing the information contained in the case file. The goal was to assess the work performed by each patrol officer for each case. This was accomplished by first determining the level of the patrol officer's contribution toward clearing the case through the assignment of clearance factors for each case, and then by determining the level of case completion accomplished by the patrol officer during the time he or she had responsibility for the case.

Each offense report included a narrative written by the responding officer, followed in some cases by a crime scene technician's supplemental report, and in all cases by the investigator's supplemental report. The initial report narratives for each of the 352 offense reports were read up to the point of the supplemental report sections. Keywords were sought which would identify the work performed by the patrol officer. The keywords were used to assign clearance factors, provided by the Richardson Police Department, to the patrol officer's actions described in the report. Guidelines were developed which defined the specific language in the case narrative that would result in a specific clearance factor being assessed for that case. Refer to Table 7 for a list of the clearance factors used in the study. A code sheet was developed in order to record the clearance factors assessed for each case (See Appendix A).

The application of clearance factors is a subjective undertaking. Therefore, in order to maintain consistency in the application of clearance factors, any discrepancies among data coding for the categorization of clearance factors was reviewed by the lead researcher. Once all the cases were reviewed, each the cases was once again reviewed by the lead researcher in order to ensure consistency in assessment.

Table 7

*Clearance Factors*

Abbreviation	Description
Suspect Arrested	Suspect Arrested
Suspect Identified	Identify suspect through witness/victim (includes known suspects)
Suspect Confession	Confessions/statements by potential suspects to officers/detectives/citizens
Computer Search	Full or partial license plate that can lead to identification through computer searches
Property Identified	Identify property linked to a suspect
Forensic Evidence	Forensic/DNA analysis/prints/lab
Police Bulletin	Info on BOLOs/intelligence bulletins/crime analysis/crime stoppers that leads to identification of suspect
Other Evidence	Other evidence (i.e., video surveillance, etc.)
Cell Phone	Cell phone information
Patterns of Offense	Patterns of offenses
Witness Sketch	Witness sketch (Identi-kit)
Unrelated Call	Citizen calls that are not directly related to any specific offense

*Definition of Clearance Factors*

The guidelines that were developed for assessment of the clearance factors are presented below, along with specific examples from each case as to why the clearance factor was chosen. For every case in the study, an internal tracking number was assigned in chronological order, providing an easy way to refer to cases under discussion. The tracking numbers are used when referring to case narrative presented as examples below.

- Suspect Arrested

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the suspect had been arrested by the patrol officer. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be



found in case number 295, where the offense was classified by the department as Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories:

[O]fficers looked through the open rear driver's side door and observed a black plastic folding toolbox opened in the back seat, a fold down DVD player screen in the backseat passenger side floorboard, and an amplifier in the back seat driver's side floorboard... Officers placed both suspects under arrest for Burglary of Vehicle and transported to the Richardson City Jail.

- Suspect Identified

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the suspect had been identified *by name* while the patrol officer was working the case. The suspect can be identified by any means, whether by a witness, by the victim, or by other suspects. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case number 167, where the offense was classified as Forcible Rape:

[T]he officer was dispatched to Parkland Hospital in reference to a sexual assault...the female advised that she had been sexually assaulted by an acquaintance known as [suspect's name].

- Suspect Confession

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the suspect had admitted to committing the offense while the case was being worked by the patrol officer. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 55, where the offense was classified as Statutory Rape:

[The suspect] confessed that he had engaged in sexual intercourse with this same victim on three dates.

- Computer Search

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the patrol officer ran license

plate searches that led to the identification of a suspect. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 209, where the offense was classified as Stolen Property Offenses:

Officer ran a computer check of the vehicle. The return showed the vehicle to be stolen out of Waco PD. Officer stopped the vehicle...

- Property Identified

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the patrol officer had identified physical property, such as a stolen car, stolen identification, stolen mail and the like which led to the identification of a suspect or linked a suspect to the crime. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 161, where the offense was

Burglary/Breaking and Entering:

[A]s he was running between the two houses the subject removed a large handful of items from his pockets and threw them over the fence...The officer retrieved six TX DLs, one check cashing card, one United Healthcare card, one social security card, one SBC Long Distance card, a check for \$500.00, a City of Plano Municipal Court form with the suspect's name on it, and several miscellaneous items...

- Forensic Evidence

For each case, analysts searched for keywords that the patrol officer had obtained forensic evidence such as fingerprints, rape exam results, breathalyzer tests, or other evidence in the case that led to the suspect being identified or linked the suspect to the crime. For example, sexual assault cases where the patrol officer took a victim to the hospital for a rape exam or cases involving "Live Scan" fingerprints were marked with this factor. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 259, where the offense was Driving While Intoxicated:

Office detected a moderate odor of an alcoholic beverage on [suspect's] breath. She admitted she had been drinking. Her eyes were red and her speech was not always clear. ...She was asked to perform field sobriety exercises, which she performed unsatisfactorily.

- Police Bulletin

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the patrol officer used “be on the lookout” (BOLO) bulletins, intelligence bulletins or other crime information which identified the suspect. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 305, where the offense was Robbery:

Officer was responding to an accident in the 200BLK of W. Spring Valley Rd. Information was received that the vehicle involved in the accident had been stolen from the apartments located at [address]

- Other Evidence

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the patrol officer had obtained video surveillance tapes or other types of miscellaneous evidence that led to suspect identification or linked the suspect to the crime. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 16, where the offense was Embezzlement:

[T]he officer was dispatched to location in reference to a delayed employee theft... The security manager provided a written statement and a copy of the in-store security videotape... The video was impounded as evidence.

- Cell Phone

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the patrol officer used cell phone information such as phone numbers, phone records, or text messages, to identify a suspect or link a suspect to the crime. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 151, where the offense was Runaway:

[Mother] provided officers with phone numbers from the [runaway daughter's] phone directory... Officers called the numbers and received voice mail... Officers attempted a reverse lookup of the phone numbers on the internet with negative results.

- Patterns of Offense

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that the patterns of offenses reported led the patrol officer to identify the suspect or link the suspect to the crime. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 173, where the offense was Motor Vehicle Theft:

Officers located 15 different types of vehicle keys in the vehicle from dealerships around the area. [Suspect's name] had \$886.00 cash in his pocket, which officers believed was the profits from selling stolen vehicles, keys, or parts. ...Suspects were additionally charged with theft of a motor vehicle or theft of motor vehicle parts due to the same method of operation and same suspect descriptions.

- Witness Sketch and Unrelated Call

For each case, analysts searched for keywords indicating that a witness sketch or a citizen call unrelated to any specific offense led to the identification of the suspect by the patrol officer. None of the cases in this study contained case narrative that led to the use of either of these clearance factors.

### *Assignment of Completion Factors*

Once the case review and data coding was completed for all 352 reports, a database was created to track the clearance factors assigned to each of the cases. The database indicated whether a clearance factor such as suspect identified, or suspect arrested was applicable to the case. The clearance factors were used to assist in defining the level of work completed by the patrol officer for each of the cases. Initially, the completion categories used to measure the patrol

officer's involvement in solving a case were minimal, significant or complete. Involvement was considered minimal if the patrol officer completed less than 50% of the work necessary to clear the case. Involvement was considered significant if the patrol officer completed at least 50% but not more than 90% of the work necessary to clear the case. The case was considered completed if the patrol officer completed over 90% of the work necessary to clear the case.

Based upon the percentage assigned to each of the three categories, a case was coded as minimal when the patrol officer was involved to the point that he or she completed at least half of the work required for the entire case. The patrol officer could collect forensic evidence, take an identification of a suspect from a witness or victim, but not necessarily have enough additional information to make an arrest in the case. In the event of a sexual assault, the patrol officer might accompany the victim to the hospital for forensic examination, and at that point patrol involvement in the case would end. The majority of the work on a case coded as minimal was completed by the detective assigned to the case.

A case was coded as significant when the patrol officer was able to identify a suspect without being able to arrest the suspect. Regardless of how the suspect was identified, suspect identification equated to significant patrol officer involvement in the case. A case was coded as completed when the patrol officer completed almost all of the work necessary to complete the case, which may include the patrol officer arresting the suspect.

Once the cases were assigned a completion factor based on the impact percentages above, it became clear that the three categories were not adequately describing the work performed by the patrol officer. The decision was made to evaluate the completion categories in order to add a new category, that of moderate. The percentages initially used described the amount of work accomplished, which was a subjective assessment and not a more objective assessment based on

the outcomes of the work performed. First, the impact categories were changed so that involvement was considered minimal if the patrol officer completed less than 25% of the work necessary to clear the case. Involvement was considered moderate if the patrol officer completed at least 25% but not more than 74% of the work necessary to clear the case whether or not the suspect was identified. Involvement was considered significant if the patrol officer completed at least 75% of the work necessary to clear the case including the identification of the suspect. The case was considered completed only if the patrol officer arrested the suspect. One of the primary concerns was the fact that unless a case was completed, the assignment of completion factors was too subjective.

Specific benchmarks were defined for each completion category and used in conjunction with the impact percentages outlined above in order to assign an appropriate completion factor to each case in a more objective, reliable fashion. Failure to use these specific benchmarks could result in erroneous data coding, such as a situation where the suspect had been identified but the involvement was considered minimal, or where an arrest had not occurred but the case was considered complete. All cases in which the patrol officer arrested the suspect were categorized as completed. All cases in which the patrol officer only completed a basic incident report, an information report, or assisted in serving a search warrant were categorized as minimal. Once the minimal and completed cases were identified, the remaining cases were reviewed again to determine whether the patrol officer's involvement and influence on solving the case was moderate or significant.

### *Definition of Completion Factors*

The guidelines that were developed for assessment of the completion factors are

presented below, along with specific examples from each case as to why the completion factor was chosen along with the clearance factors assigned to each case.

- Minimal

A case was designated as minimal in situations where the patrol officer initiated an offense report during the call, but did not initiate any additional investigation. In addition, calls involving the execution of search warrants were designated minimal. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 150, where the offense was Drug Equipment Violations. No additional clearance factors were assigned to this case: “Officer... executed a search warrant at [suspect location]...”

Another example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 67, where the offense was Runaway. An information report was taken and the case immediately forwarded to Youth Crimes Unit for follow-up. No additional clearance factors were assigned to this case:

The parent was advised that [the child] got on the bus in front of his house and the parent thought he was going to school... The parent was advised that the child did not come to school today... This is the fourth runaway report RPD has taken on [the child] in the last year...

- Moderate

A case was designated as moderate in situations where the patrol officer initiated an offense report during the call, and conducted a limited preliminary investigation of the offense. The investigation conducted by the patrol officer did not constitute a majority of the total investigative work on the case. For example, a case was coded as moderate when the officer conducted such preliminary investigation activities as the recovery of forensic evidence or

obtained a limited identification of a suspect from a witness or victim without enough additional information to further identify the suspect or make an arrest in the case. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 207, where the offense was False Pretense/Swindle/Confidence Game. The work performed was more than minimal but less than 75% of the work necessary to solve the case. The clearance factor assigned to this case was “suspect identified.”

Upon arrival, officers contacted [the witness]... Officer’s check of [suspect’s] identity revealed that he resides at [suspect’s address], which is located a short distance from the offense location. Officers attempted to contact [suspect] at his residence but were unsuccessful. ...officers observed an unidentified subject leaving from the rear of the residence on foot but were unable to detain them. Officers checked the area for [suspect] but were unable to locate him.

- Significant

A case was designated as significant in situations where the patrol officer initiated an offense report during the call, and conducted substantial additional investigation without leading to an arrest. The investigation conducted by the patrol officer constituted a majority of the total investigative work in the case, although the arrest was completed by the investigator assigned to the case. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 22, where the offense was Aggravated Assault. The officer clearly performed many additional duties that were greater than 75% of the work required to clear the case, although the suspect was not arrested by the patrol officer. The arrest was completed by the investigations division at a later time. The clearance factors assigned to this case were “suspect identified” and “other evidence”:

Upon the officer’s arrival, it was learned that the suspect had already left the scene on foot. ...Officer noticed that [victim’s] neck was marked with abrasions that were photographed... able to locate RPD records for [suspect] and obtained a mug shot photograph of him. This photograph was included in a six picture photo lineup later viewed by [victim]. [Witness] also provided a written statement regarding this offence. ... [Witness] took officer through the residence and pointed out structure damage... On



the floor of the northwest bedroom, officer saw, in plain view, a clear plastic bag that contained items commonly associated with heroin use. ...These paraphernalia items were impounded along with the photo lineup... The neighborhood was searched but the suspects were not found. ...Later, the officer obtained an arrest warrant for [suspect].

- Completed

A case was designated as completed in situations where the patrol officer issued a citation or arrested the suspect. An example of case narrative that led to this conclusion can be found in case 277, where the offense was Liquor Law Violations. The clearance factors assigned to this case were “suspect arrested” and “other evidence”:

Officers detected a strong odor of an alcoholic beverage on [the suspect’s] breath. When asked how much he had to drink, [the suspect] replied ‘a lot’. [The suspect] was taken into custody and transported...

### *Limitations of the Study*

#### Subjective Nature of Data Coding

During the study of the patrol officer’s impact in solving crime, limitations to the research surfaced which should be discussed further. A major limitation to this study is the accuracy of the data coding for completion factors based on the subjective assignment of the moderate and significant completion factors to the cases under review. To aid in the understanding of the differences between moderate and significant, an arbitrary completion percentage was assigned to each of these categories. Therefore, a moderate completion factor equated to the patrol officer performing 25% to 74% of the investigative work in the case, and a significant completion factor equated to the patrol officer performing 75% or more of the investigative work in the case without arresting the suspect. In reality, there is no way to

differentiate between a patrol officer solving 74% of the investigative work, earning a moderate factor, and 75% of the investigative work, earning a significant factor.

The completion factors of minimal and completed are concrete interpretations of the data. A case is only completed when the suspect has been arrested by the patrol officer. A case is only coded as minimal when the patrol officer initiates a report only or assists in serving a search warrant. Although the minimal completion factor includes a percentage, this percentage was included to aid in the understanding of the category, and not just to reflect that 25% of the investigative work on the case was completed. Therefore, the limitation found based on subjective data coding is mitigated by the fact that data coding is based on concrete parameters which accurately reflect case completion for 74.8% of all cases in the study, where 17.1% of the cases were coded minimal and 57.7% of the cases were coded as completed.

#### Variance in Initial Report Narrative

The narrative included in each police report varied widely as to the thoroughness of information included. There is no way to standardize the data contained in these reports, as they are written by different individuals. Researcher analysts encountered some case files where multiple offenses were charged, but the suspect was not arrested for every offense, regardless of where that offense occurred. The issue then arises in these situations as to whether or not the entire case should be marked as completed when a suspect is arrested, even if one of the multiple offenses in the case file remain open.

#### Inter-rater Reliability

Another major limitation to this study is the reliability of data coding when four different

analysts coded the data, and then one individual re-reviewed all data. Each of the analysts coded a certain number of case files, but all four did not code all files and compare the results. Once the change occurred where the moderate category was added, all of the data was then re-analyzed by the lead analyst, further reducing the reliability of data coding.

The concern with so few analysts assigning completion factors of minimal, moderate, significant, and completed is the accuracy of the coding. This concern is based on the subjective nature of data coding and the wide variations of the narrative included in the case report. Not every patrol officer writes reports in the same manner, and the quality of the information contained in the report can affect how the case narrative is coded from one case to the next. In addition, different analysts interpret the language of the narrative in different ways, which can affect how the clearance factors are applied from one analyst to the next.

During data coding, analysts became confused as to when to assign the clearance factors of “forensic evidence,” “other evidence,” and “property identified.” The narrative in the case file either did not adequately describe the evidence gathered or the analysts confused the language contained in the narrative. To mitigate this confusion, once the initial data coding occurred, each case was re-evaluated when these three specific clearance factors were present in order to be sure that clearance factors were accurately assigned to each case. The data coding guidelines may need to be clarified if they are used in the future to avoid confusion regarding the work completed by the patrol officer.

## Question 2: The Investigator’s Activities

The second phase of this study was an analysis of time detectives spent conducting the follow-up investigation. In order to gain a complete understanding of the role of the detective in

the department, it was necessary to review time spent on investigative tasks and on other activities not related to case investigation. The amount of time a detective spends on different activities can be used to ascertain whether some functions can be shifted from the detective to patrol or other personnel in the department. This reassignment can enable the detective to concentrate on conducting complex case investigations in a more thorough and efficient manner.

### *Case-Related Investigation*

Detectives were asked to keep detailed logs of the time spent each day on case related activities. Departmental administrators developed the list of tasks that were to be tracked as part of this effort. The activities were placed into a time sheet format so that detectives could easily identify the number of minutes spent each day conducting case investigations. The Case Activity Time Sheet may be found in Appendix B. In addition to tracking tasks, detectives identified the offense being investigated and the disposition of the case. Disposition types were arrest, exceptionally cleared, inactive, pending with warrant, and unfounded. Further, the detectives indicated any issues, or case enhancers, that were involved in investigating the case such as complex evidence, multiple victims or witnesses, extensive evidence, or language barriers. A list of the tasks involved in case-related investigation can be found in Table 8. A detailed definition for each of these tasks can be found in Appendix B.

Case-related time logs were collected for all cases assigned to each detective from November 15 through December 15, 2005. Detectives continued to track their case related activity from December 15, 2005 through January 15, 2006, but only for those cases that were assigned during the November 15 to December 15 timeframe. This allowed data to be collected for a two-month time period, which allowed investigators ample time to work on cases assigned

to them during the first half of December. The two-month time period provided a more accurate representation of the total time spent investigating a case. In all, detailed time logs were completed for a total of 351 cases assigned to detectives for investigation.

Table 8

*Case-Related Investigative Tasks*

Task
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Login of Case/Review of Case</li> <li>• Suspect Interviews/Interrogations</li> <li>• Record/Database Computer Searches (non-suspect)</li> <li>• Supplement Preparation</li> <li>• Locating Wanted Suspects/Runaways</li> <li>• Book-In/Custody Reports</li> <li>• Consulting with Other Agencies/Other RPD Detectives/D.A.s/CPS</li> <li>• Juvenile Book-In / Juvenile Transport (LETOT/County)</li> <li>• Juvenile Magistrate Warnings/Interview</li> <li>• Record/Database Computer Searches (suspect)</li> <li>• Contacts with Victim, Complainant, Witness</li> <li>• Arrest/Search Warrant/Seizure Preparation</li> <li>• Polygraphs</li> <li>• Subpoena of Records (Grand Jury Signing)</li> <li>• View Evidence/Dispositions on Property Cards/View Video Evidence</li> <li>• Case Preparation</li> <li>• Photo Line-ups</li> <li>• Property Recovery/Search for Evidence or Property</li> <li>• Crime Analysis/BOLOs/Intel Dissemination</li> <li>• Case Correspondence (5-Day Letters) Referrals/ Updates via Chain</li> <li>• Surveillance</li> <li>• Auto Pound</li> <li>• Neighborhood Canvass</li> </ul>

*All Other Activity*

Detectives were asked to keep detailed logs of the time spent each day on activity not related to their current case assignments. Departmental administrators assisted researchers in

developing the list of tasks that were to be tracked as part of this effort. The activities were placed into a time sheet format so that detectives could easily identify the number of minutes spent each day on tasks not related to their current case assignments. The time logs also included activities related to the work completed on cases assigned to other detectives in the department. Detectives maintained these time logs for a one-month period of time, from November 15 through December 15, 2005. A list of the investigator's tasks not related to case assignments can be found in Table 9. The Other Activity Time Sheet may be found in Appendix C.

Table 9

*Investigator's Tasks Not Related to Current Case Assignments*

Task
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assist on Cases Assigned to other Detectives</li> <li>• Community Presentations or Meetings</li> <li>• Auction</li> <li>• Vehicle Inspections</li> <li>• Vehicle Maintenance and Refuel</li> <li>• Internal Meetings – either Sector, Unit, or Division</li> <li>• External Meetings – Intelligence Gathering</li> <li>• Projects or Special Assignments</li> <li>• Assist other Police Departments and other Richardson Police Department Detectives</li> <li>• General Computer Work – emails, time sheets, crime statistics, database entries</li> <li>• Attend schools or in-service training</li> <li>• Instructing or Training Others</li> <li>• Court or Grand Jury Testimony</li> <li>• Miscellaneous Delegated Tasks</li> <li>• Other Tasks</li> </ul>

*Data Analysis*

Before an analysis of the data began, both sets of time sheets were analyzed to ensure that the detectives entered the time in minutes for each activity. For those time sheets where the time

was entered time in hours or tenths of hours, the time was converted into minutes. All of the time sheets for case-related activity and other activity were entered into a database, and the total minutes calculated for each task.

### *Limitations of the Study*

Fewer limitations exist for the study of the investigator's time, as the logs were maintained by the individual detectives, and the lead researcher only computed the time. The only significant limitation is that the accuracy of the time logs cannot be verified as the researcher did not directly observe the work being performed. To mitigate this limitation, researchers would have to remain at the department and shadow the investigator in order to keep detailed time logs that reflected the work actually being performed. The time logs did not seem to be at risk for inaccuracies during the data collection process. Detailed information regarding the time spent by investigators on case-related activities and on all other activity can be found in Chapter 4.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research findings propose an answer to the following questions:

- What role do patrol officers play in solving cases assigned to investigations?
- How do detectives spend their time?

The answer to the first question was obtained through an examination of how often a patrol officer clears a case that has been assigned to the investigations division. A review of 352 offense reports was conducted and data coding methods applied to the case narrative in order to assess the patrol officer's level of involvement in solving the case, whether minimal, moderate, significant, or completed. Each of the cases included in the study were cleared by arrest or exceptionally cleared. Solving the case refers to the patrol officer arresting the suspect or clearing the case by exception. The answer to the second question was obtained by capturing the amount of time detectives spent on case related activities and on other activities not related to case investigation. The results of the data analysis for both of these research questions are presented in this chapter.

#### Question 1: The Patrol Officer's Role in Solving Crime

The patrol officer's involvement in solving a case was determined to be minimal, moderate, significant, or completed based on the assignment of clearance factors to each case. The percent of cases assigned to each category was calculated for each of the five investigative units within the Richardson Police Department. The units are Crimes Against Persons (CAPERS), Youth Crimes (YCD), Forgery-Fraud (FF), Property Crimes (Property), and Vice and Narcotics (V&N).



Richardson's Investigations Division is organized into two main organizations, Major Crimes and Sector Crimes. The Major Crimes Division includes the CAPERS and Forgery-Fraud units, and the Sector Crimes Division includes the Property Crimes and Youth Crimes units. The Vice and Narcotics Unit works cases in both Major Crimes and Sector Crimes. CAPERS detectives investigate criminal cases involving assault, family violence, robbery, sex offenses, harassment, or death. Forgery detectives investigate criminal cases involving forged checks, credit/debit card abuse and identity theft. Property Crimes detectives investigate criminal offenses involving burglary, theft, and criminal trespass. Youth Crimes detectives investigate criminal offenses involving juvenile offenders. Vice and Narcotics detectives investigate criminal offenses involving drugs, alcohol, narcotics, gambling, and prostitution (www.cor.net).

Table 10 presents the results from the case file analysis with regard to patrol officer involvement in solving cases, indicating both the percentage of total cases and the number of cases for each unit. The cases studied were either exceptionally cleared or cleared by arrest.

Table 10

*Patrol Officer Involvement in Solving Cases Cleared by Exception or by Arrest*

Category	CAPERS	YCD	FF	Property	V&N	Total
Minimal	26.0% (20)	10.7% (11)	23.1% (6)	20.2% (17)	9.7% (6)	17.1% (60)
Moderate	28.6% (22)	7.8% (8)	15.4% (4)	17.9% (15)	0.0% (0)	13.9% (49)
Significant	23.4% (18)	9.7% (10)	7.7% (2)	10.7% (9)	1.6% (1)	11.4% (40)
Completed	22.1% (17)	71.8% (74)	53.9% (14)	51.2% (43)	88.7% (55)	57.7% (203)
Total Offenses	77	103	26	84	62	352

Overall, the patrol officer arrested the suspect or exceptionally cleared a majority (57.7%) of all cases assigned to the investigations division. The patrol officer completed a significant amount of the case investigation effort in 11.4% of the cases assigned to the investigations division. Significant involvement meant that the patrol officer completed more than 75% of the investigative work in the case, but did not arrest the suspect. Taken together, these results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted the case solvability or completed the case in a total of 69.1% of the cases analyzed during this study.

On the other hand, the patrol officer completed a moderate amount of the investigative effort in 13.9% of cases, and a minimal amount in 17.1% of the cases. Moderate involvement meant that the patrol officer completed more than 25% but less than 75% of the investigative work in the case. Minimal involvement meant that the patrol officer only completed the initial report without performing any additional investigation at the scene or thereafter. Taken together, these results show that the patrol officer impacted case solvability by completing not more than 75% of the investigative work in 31% of the cases analyzed during this study.

The patrol officer's impact on solving cases also varied between investigative units. The Crimes Against Persons unit was assigned 77 of the 352 cases included in this study. Patrol officers completed 22.1% of cases in this unit, contributed significantly in 23.4% of the cases, contributed moderately in 28.6%, and contributed minimally in 26% of the cases. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved a total of 45.5% of the cases assigned to this unit. Patrol officers solved or significantly impacted fewer cases in this unit than in any other. As demonstrated in the review of literature, Dempsey (1996) found that the more serious the offense committed, the greater the likelihood that a detective will investigate. Cases within this unit involve offenses such as homicide, rape, and robbery, which require more time,

knowledge and resources to resolve. Therefore, it is reasonable to assert that patrol officers will solve cases involving crimes against persons at a lower rate than other crimes encountered.

The Youth Crimes unit was assigned 103 of the 352 cases included in this study, representing about one-third of the total cases analyzed. Patrol officers completed 71.8% of the cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly in 9.7% of the cases, contributed moderately in 7.8% of the cases, and contributed minimally in 10.7% of the cases. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved a total of 81.5% of the cases assigned to this unit.

The Forgery-Fraud unit was assigned 26 of the 352 cases included in this study. Patrol officers completed 53.9% of cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly to 7.7% of the cases, contributed moderately to 15.4% of the cases, and contributed minimally to 23.1% of the cases. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved 61.6% of the cases assigned to this unit.

The Property Crimes unit was assigned 84 of the 352 cases included in this study. Patrol officers completed 51.2% of the cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly to 10.7% of the cases, contributed moderately to 17.9% of the cases, and contributed minimally to 20.2% of the cases. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved 61.9% of the cases assigned to this unit.

The Vice and Narcotics unit was assigned 62 of the 352 cases included in this study. Patrol officers completed 88.7% of the cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly to 1.6% of the cases, and contributed minimally to 9.7% of the cases. None of the cases assigned to this unit were impacted moderately by patrol officers. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved 90.3% of the cases assigned to this unit. Patrol officers impacted the greatest percentage of cases in this unit more than in any other. The nature of the encounter

between the patrol officer and suspect for these offenses is a likely reason for this finding. In the cases studied, patrol officers indicated in the initial report narrative that they performed narcotics arrests as part of some other interaction with the suspect, such as a traffic stop or burglary investigation.

In addition to reviewing the data across units, patrol officer impact can be assessed through an examination of case completion across offenses represented in the sample of 352 cases. Table 11 indicates the number of cases assigned to each completion factor, and the percentage of cases completed for each offense category. The patrol officer completed a majority of cases, 50.0% or greater, for the following offenses:

- Forcible Rape (50.0%)
- Burglary/Breaking and Entering (55.6%)
- Shoplifting (83.3%)
- Theft from Coin-Operated Machine or Device (66.7%)
- Theft from Motor Vehicle (54.5%)
- Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories (69.2%)
- All Other Larceny (75.0%)
- Forgery/Counterfeiting (81.8%)
- Impersonation (60.0%)
- Stolen Property Offenses (Receiving, etc.) (100.0%)
- Drug Possession (89.5%)
- Drug Equipment Violations (84.6%)
- Statutory Rape (60.0%)
- Weapon Law Violations (100.0%)
- Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations (100.0%)

- Abuse Language/Noise/Misconduct (77.8%)
- Driving Under the Influence (100%)
- Drunkenness (100.0%)
- Consumption of Alcohol Minor/Open Container (100.0%)
- Evade Arrest/Suspicious Person/FLID-FUG (91.7%)

Table 11

*Case Completion by Offense for Cases Cleared by Exception or by Arrest*

IBR Code	Offense	Total Cases	Min	Mod	Sig	Comp	% of Comp
09A	Murder & Non-Negligent Manslaughter	1	0	1	0	0	0
100	Kidnapping/Abduction	2	1	1	0	0	0
11A	Forcible Rape	4	1	1	0	2	50.0
11B	Forcible Sodomy	3	1	1	1	0	0
11C	Sexual Assault with an Object	4	1	2	1	0	0
11D	Forcible Fondling	6	1	3	1	1	16.7
120	Robbery	10	2	3	2	3	30.0
13A	Aggravated Assault	17	2	3	4	8	47.1
13B	Simple Assault	18	3	3	4	8	44.4
13C	Intimidation	9	5	2	2	0	0
220	Burglary/Breaking and Entering	9	1	2	1	5	55.6
23B	Purse Snatching	1	1	0	0	0	0
23C	Shoplifting	12	1	1	0	10	83.3
23D	Theft from Buildings	14	3	2	5	4	28.6
23E	Theft from Coin-Operated Machine or Device	3	0	0	1	2	66.7
23F	Theft from Motor Vehicle	11	2	1	2	6	54.5
23G	Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories	13	0	4	0	9	69.2
23H	All Other Larceny	8	1	1	0	6	75.0
240	Motor Vehicle Theft	12	6	3	0	3	25.0
250	Forgery/Counterfeiting	11	1	1	0	9	81.8
26A	False Pretense/Swindle/Confidence Game	9	3	1	1	4	44.4
26B	Fraud Credit Card/Automated Teller Machines	6	0	1	3	2	33.3
26C	Impersonation	10	0	3	1	6	60.0
270	Embezzlement	6	2	2	0	2	33.3
280	Stolen Property Offenses (Receiving, etc.)	12	0	0	0	12	100
290	Destructive/Damage/Vandalism of Property	11	3	3	4	1	9.1

*(table continues)*

Table 11 (*continued*).

IBR Code	Offense	Total Cases	Min	Mod	Sig	Comp	% of Comp
35A	Drug Possession	19	1	0	1	17	89.5
35B	Drug Equipment Violations	13	2	0	0	11	84.6
36B	Statutory Rape	5	1	0	1	3	60.0
39B	Operating/Promoting/Assisting Gambling	1	1	0	0	0	0
520	Weapon Law Violations	12	0	0	0	12	100
90B	Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations	7	0	0	0	7	100
90C	Abuse Language/Noise/Misconduct	9	1	0	1	7	77.8
90D	Driving Under the Influence	6	0	0	0	6	100
90E	Drunkenness	6	0	0	0	6	100
90F	Family Offenses, Non Violent	7	2	0	2	3	42.9
90G	Consumption of Alcohol Minor/Open Container	8	0	0	0	8	100
90I	Runaway	14	7	2	1	4	28.6
90J	Trespass of Real Property	11	3	2	1	5	45.5
90Z	Evade Arrest/Suspicious Person/FLID-FUG	12	1	0	0	11	91.7
Totals		Number	352	60	49	40	203
		Percentage		17.1	13.9	11.4	57.7

This data reveals that patrol officers solve a majority of the cases for offenses such as Driving Under the Influence and Drug Possession, where arrests generally occur through the officer's direct contact with the suspect. Patrol officers also solve a majority of Burglary, Larceny and other property offenses, where arrests occur as a result of preliminary investigation.

### *The Impact of Cases Cleared by Exception*

An analysis of the patrol officer's impact on solving crime would not be complete without a thorough review of the cases in the sample that were cleared by arrest, without including those cases that were cleared by exception. The purpose of this analysis is to verify that the inclusion of cases cleared by exception do not alter the finding that patrol officers cleared a majority of cases assigned to the investigations division. A case is cleared by exception

for a variety of reasons such as insufficient evidence, lack of victim or witness cooperation, or the suspect passing away during the case investigation. A case can be cleared by exception at any point during the criminal investigation process by either the patrol officer or the detective.

In order to determine the impact of exceptionally cleared cases on the overall findings of Research Question 1, all of the 352 cases were reviewed. The number of cases cleared by exception, along with the unit assigned, and the completion factors assigned were noted. Table 12 summarizes the cases that were cleared by exception and those cleared by arrest for each of the offense types in the study sample. The table indicates the IBR code, the offense description, the original sample size, and the total number of cases within the sample that were cleared by exception and cleared by arrest for each offense. Of the original 352 cases in the sample, 58 of these were cleared by exception, leaving a total of 294 cases cleared by arrest.

Table 12

*Sample Selected by IBR Code for Cases Cleared by Exception or by Arrest*

IBR Code	Offense	Sample Size	Cleared by Exception	Cleared by Arrest
09A	Murder & Non-Negligent Manslaughter	1	1	0
100	Kidnapping/Abduction	2	1	1
11A	Forcible Rape	4	1	3
11B	Forcible Sodomy	3	0	3
11C	Sexual Assault with an Object	4	0	4
11D	Forcible Fondling	6	1	5
120	Robbery	10	1	9
13A	Aggravated Assault	17	4	13
13B	Simple Assault	18	6	12
13C	Intimidation	9	2	7
220	Burglary/Breaking and Entering	9	1	8
23B	Purse Snatching	1	0	1
23C	Shoplifting	12	1	11
23D	Theft from Buildings	14	7	7

*(table continues)*

Table 12 (*continued*).

IBR Code	Offense	Sample Size	Cleared by Exception	Cleared by Arrest
23E	Theft from Coin-Operated Machine or Device	3	0	3
23F	Theft from Motor Vehicle	11	0	11
23G	Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories	13	1	12
23H	All Other Larceny	8	1	7
240	Motor Vehicle Theft	12	1	11
250	Forgery/Counterfeiting	11	0	11
26A	False Pretense/Swindle/Confidence Game	9	2	7
26B	Fraud Credit Card/Automated Teller Machines	6	1	5
26C	Impersonation	10	1	9
270	Embezzlement	6	0	6
280	Stolen Property Offenses (Receiving, etc.)	12	2	10
290	Destructive/Damage/Vandalism of Property	11	6	5
35A	Drug Possession	18	0	18
35B	Drug Equipment Violations	13	1	12
36B	Statutory Rape	5	1	4
39B	Operating/Promoting/Assisting Gambling	1	0	1
520	Weapon Law Violations	12	0	12
90B	Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations	7	0	7
90C	Abuse Language/Noise/Misconduct	10	0	10
90D	Driving Under the Influence	6	0	6
90E	Drunkenness	6	0	6
90F	Family Offenses, Non Violent	7	0	7
90G	Consumption of Alcohol Minor/Open Container	8	0	8
90I	Runaway	14	9	5
90J	Trespass of Real Property	11	5	6
90Z	Evade Arrest/Suspicious Person/FLID-FUG	12	1	11
Total		352	58	294

The cases that were exceptionally cleared were removed from the database, leaving only those cases cleared by arrest. The percentage of total cases and the number of cases for each unit was calculated, and the results are presented in Table 13. Of the 58 cases that were cleared by



exception, 18 were assigned to the CAPERS unit, 15 to the Youth Crimes unit, 5 to the Forgery-Fraud unit, 19 to the Property unit, and one to the Vice and Narcotics unit.

Table 13

*Patrol Officer Involvement in Solving Cases Cleared by Arrest*

Category	CAPERS	YCD	FF	Property	V&N	Total
Minimal	27.1% (16)	3.4% (3)	14.3% (3)	18.5% (12)	8.2% (6)	13.3% (39)
Moderate	22.0% (13)	7.8% (5)	14.3% (3)	13.8% (9)	0.0% (0)	10.2% (30)
Significant	22.0% (13)	9.7% (6)	4.8% (1)	7.7% (5)	1.6% (1)	8.8% (26)
Completed	28.8% (17)	84.1% (74)	66.7% (14)	60.0% (39)	90.2% (55)	67.7% (199)
Total Offenses	59	88	21	65	61	294

For those cases cleared by arrest, the patrol officer arrested the suspect in a majority (67.7%) of all cases assigned to the investigations division. The patrol officer completed a significant amount of the case investigation effort in 8.8% of the cases assigned to the investigations division. Taken together, these results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted the case solvability or completed the case in a total of 76.5% of the cases analyzed during this study. On the other hand, the patrol officer completed a moderate amount of the investigative effort in 10.2% of cases and a minimal amount in 13.3% of the cases, for a total of 23.5% of the 294 cases in the study.

Once cases cleared by exception are removed from the sample, these findings show a 10% increase in cases completed by patrol officers and a 2.6% decrease in those cases significantly impacted by patrol officers. Taken together, patrol officers completed or

significantly impacted an additional 7.4% of cases when cases cleared by exception are removed from the sample. Similarly, patrol officers moderately impacted 3.7% fewer cases and minimally impacted 3.8% fewer cases once those cases cleared by exception were removed from the sample. Taken together, these results show that patrol officers impacted case solvability by completing not more than 75% of the investigative work in 7.5% fewer cases than shown when cases cleared by exception were included in the sample.

A review of the patrol officer's impact across investigative units reveals that 59 of the 294 cases included in this study were assigned to the CAPERS unit. Patrol officers completed 28.8% of cases, contributed significantly in 22.0% of the cases, contributed moderately in 22.0% of the cases, and contributed minimally in 27.1% of the cases. Overall patrol officers impacted cases in this unit in a proportionally similar degree to the impacts found when cases cleared by exception were included in the study. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved a total of 50.8% of the cases assigned to this unit, which is still lower than any other unit in the investigations division. As stated by Dempsey (1996), offenses such as homicide, rape, and robbery require more time, knowledge and resources to resolve, resulting in patrol officers solving cases involving crimes against persons at a lower rate than other crimes encountered.

The Youth Crimes unit was assigned 88 of the 294 cases included in this study, the largest number of cases assigned to any of the five units. Patrol officers completed 84.1% of the cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly in 9.7% of the cases, contributed moderately in 7.8% of the cases, and contributed minimally in 3.4% of the cases. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved a total of 93.8% of the cases assigned to this unit. Patrol officers impacted the greatest percentage of cases in this unit more so than any other, once

cases cleared by exception were removed from the study. Most of the cases in the minimal category were exceptionally cleared in the original analysis. None of the other categories showed any significant change. Therefore, the patrol officer closed a higher percentage of the total cases assigned to this unit once the exceptionally cleared cases were removed. The nature of the encounter between the patrol officer and suspect for these offenses is another likely reason for this finding. In the cases studied, patrol officers indicated in the initial report narrative that they were called to schools, malls, and homes and arrested juvenile offenders who were either in the custody of the complainant or were apprehended on the premises during interaction with the complainant.

The Forgery-Fraud unit was assigned 21 of the 294 cases included in this study. Patrol officers completed 66.7% of cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly to 4.8% of the cases, contributed moderately to 14.3% of the cases, and contributed minimally to 14.3% of the cases. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved 71.5% of the cases assigned to this unit. Overall patrol officers impacted cases in this division in a proportionally similar degree to the impacts found when cases cleared by exception were included in the study.

The Property Crimes unit was assigned 65 of the 294 cases included in this study. Patrol officers completed 60.0% of the cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly to 7.7% of the cases, contributed moderately to 13.8% of the cases, and contributed minimally to 18.5% of the cases. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved 67.7% of the cases assigned to this unit. Overall patrol officers impacted cases in this unit in a proportionally similar degree to the impacts found when cases cleared by exception were included in the study.

The Vice and Narcotics unit was assigned 61 of the 294 cases included in this study. Patrol officers completed 90.2% of the cases assigned to this unit, contributed significantly to 1.6% of the cases, and contributed minimally to 8.2% of the cases. None of the cases assigned to this unit were impacted moderately by patrol officers. The results show that the patrol officer substantially impacted or solved 91.8% of the cases assigned to this unit, which is substantially unchanged from the previous analysis. Patrol officers impacted the second greatest percentage of cases in this unit more so than any other. The nature of the encounter between the patrol officer and suspect for these offenses is a likely reason for this finding, where narcotics arrests are made due to other interactions with the suspect, such as traffic stops.

In addition to reviewing the data across units, patrol officer impact can be assessed through an examination of case completion across offenses, represented in the sample of 294 cases. Table 14 indicates the number of cases assigned to each completion factor, and the percentage of cases completed for each offense category.

The patrol officer cleared a majority of cases, 50.0% or greater, for the following offense categories:

- Forcible Rape (66.7%)
- Aggravated Assault (61.5%)
- Simple Assault (66.7%)
- Burglary/Breaking and Entering (62.5%)
- Shoplifting (90.9%)
- Theft from Buildings (57.1%)
- Theft from Coin-Operated Machine or Device (66.7%)
- Theft from Motor Vehicle (54.5%)
- Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories (75.0%)

- All Other Larceny (85.7%)
- Forgery/Counterfeiting (81.8%)
- False Pretense/Swindle/Confidence Game (57.1%)
- Impersonation (66.7%)
- Stolen Property Offenses (Receiving, etc.) (100.0%)
- Drug Possession (89.5%)
- Drug Equipment Violations (91.7%)
- Statutory Rape (75.0%)
- Weapon Law Violations (100.0%)
- Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations (100.0%)
- Abuse Language/Noise/Misconduct (77.8%)
- Driving Under the Influence (100%)
- Drunkenness (100.0%)
- Consumption of Alcohol Minor/Open Container (100.0%)
- Runaway (80.0%)
- Evade Arrest/Suspicious Person/FLID-FUG (90.9%)

Table 14

*Case Completion by Offense for Cases Cleared by Arrest*

IBR Code	Offense	Total Cases	Min	Mod	Sig	Comp	% of Comp
09A	Murder & Non-Negligent Manslaughter	0	0	0	0	0	0
100	Kidnapping/Abduction	1	1	0	0	0	0
11A	Forcible Rape	3	1	0	0	2	66.7
11B	Forcible Sodomy	3	1	1	1	0	0
11C	Sexual Assault with an Object	4	1	2	1	0	0
11D	Forcible Fondling	5	1	2	1	1	20.0
120	Robbery	9	2	2	2	3	33.3

*(table continues)*

Table 14 (continued).

IBR Code	Offense	Total Cases	MIN	MOD	SIG	COMP	% of COMP
13A	Aggravated Assault	13	2	1	2	8	61.5
13B	Simple Assault	12	1	2	1	8	66.7
13C	Intimidation	7	4	1	2	0	0
220	Burglary/Breaking and Entering	8	1	1	1	5	62.5
23B	Purse Snatching	1	1	0	0	0	0
23C	Shoplifting	11	1	0	0	10	90.9
23D	Theft from Buildings	7	1	1	1	4	57.1
23E	Theft from Coin-Operated Machine or Device	3	0	0	1	2	66.7
23F	Theft from Motor Vehicle	11	2	1	2	6	54.5
23G	Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories	12	0	3	0	9	75.0
23H	All Other Larceny	7	0	1	0	6	85.7
240	Motor Vehicle Theft	11	5	3	0	3	27.3
250	Forgery/Counterfeiting	11	1	1	0	9	81.8
26A	False Pretense/Swindle/Confidence Game	7	1	1	1	4	57.1
26B	Fraud Credit Card/Automated Teller Machines	5	0	0	3	2	40.0
26C	Impersonation	9	0	2	1	6	66.7
270	Embezzlement	6	2	2	0	2	33.3
280	Stolen Property Offenses (Receiving, etc.)	10	0	0	0	10	100
290	Destructive/Damage/Vandalism of Property	5	2	1	1	1	20.0
35A	Drug Possession	19	1	0	1	17	89.5
35B	Drug Equipment Violations	12	1	0	0	11	91.7
36B	Statutory Rape	4	0	0	1	3	75.0
39B	Operating/Promoting/Assisting Gambling	1	1	0	0	0	0
520	Weapon Law Violations	12	0	0	0	12	100
90B	Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations	7	0	0	0	7	100
90C	Abuse Language/Noise/Misconduct	9	1	0	1	7	77.8
90D	Driving Under the Influence	6	0	0	0	6	100
90E	Drunkenness	6	0	0	0	6	100
90F	Family Offenses, Non Violent	7	2	0	2	3	42.9
90G	Consumption of Alcohol Minor/Open Container	8	0	0	0	8	100
90I	Runaway	5	0	1	0	4	80.0
90J	Trespass of Real Property	6	1	1	0	4	66.7
90Z	Evade Arrest/Suspicious Person/FLID-FUG	11	1	0	0	10	90.9
Totals		Number	294	39	30	26	199
		Percentage		13.3	10.2	8.8	67.9

This data reveals that patrol officers solve a majority of the cases for offenses such as Driving Under the Influence and Drug Possession. Arrests for these offenses generally occur through the officer's direct contact with the suspect. Patrol officers solve a majority of Burglary, Larceny and other property offenses, where arrests occur as a result of preliminary investigation.

When the findings of both analyses were compared, the patrol officers continued to solve a majority of cases for the same offenses. This is reflected in the fact that percentages of completion by offense category increased for each category when cases cleared by exception were removed from the sample of cases. In addition, new categories were added in which patrol officers solved a majority of cases, such as aggravated assault, simple assault, theft from buildings, and runaway. No offense categories were removed from the list of offenses in which the patrol officer solved a majority of cases once cases cleared by exception were removed from the sample.

## Question 2: The Investigator's Activities

Detectives were asked to keep detailed time logs of the number of minutes each day they spent working on case investigations as well as on other activity not related to current case assignments. The time spent on case investigations was captured over a two month period, and the time spent on all other activity was captured over a one month period of time. The first month of data capture for both categories of time was November 15 to December 15, 2005. Case-related data was captured for an additional one month period so that detectives could complete work on those case assignments made during the first month of the study period. A total of 351 cases were assigned for investigation during the study period. Unlike the previous analysis of patrol officer impact on solving cases, the cases included in this sample did not have

any restrictions on the disposition of the case. The dispositions included not only cleared by arrest or cleared by exception, but also included dispositions such as suspended, unfounded, information, and the like.

### *Case Related Investigation*

The time detectives spent on case-related activity was analyzed across the five investigative units in the Richardson Police Department: Crimes Against Persons (CAPERS), Youth Crimes Division (YCD), Forgery-Fraud (FF), Property Crimes (Property), and Operational Support Unit (OSU). In the study of patrol officer impact on solving crime, the fifth unit was referred to as Vice and Narcotics rather than Operational Support. The Operational Support Unit (OSU) is a modified version of the Vice and Narcotics Unit, but performs the same investigative responsibilities. The analysis of case-related activity performed by detectives is presented in Table 15. The table outlines the percentage of total time spent on investigative activity for each unit, as well as the percentage of total time spent across all units for the 351 case investigations included in the study. Case assignments during the study period were divided as follows: 83 cases were assigned to Crimes Against Persons; 67 cases were assigned to Youth Crimes; 22 cases were assigned to Forgery-Fraud; 135 were assigned to Property Crimes; and 44 were assigned to Operational Support.

The time spent on each activity was tracked in minutes. For each unit, the number of minutes each detective spent per activity was totaled, and a grand total number of minutes for all activities calculated. The amount of time spent on each activity was then expressed as a percentage of total time. The same calculation was applied to the total time spent on each activity across all units.



Table 15

*Investigator's Time on Case-Related Activities (% Total Time Reported)*

Activity	CAPERS	YCD	FF	Property	OSU	Total
Login Of Case/Review Of Case	9.0	9.6	8.5	9.9	7.3	9.2
Suspect Interviews/Interrogations	5.5	10.8	3.6	6.0	4.9	6.4
Record/Database Computer Searches (Non-Suspect)	2.6	3.9	11.9	2.6	9.4	4.9
Supplement Preparation	20.3	17.5	12.1	18.0	13.3	17.0
Locating Wanted Suspects/Runaways	2.7	0.8	4.5	4.4	3.3	3.3
Book-In/Custody Reports	0.9	1.4	1.4	0.6	2.0	1.1
Consulting With Other Agencies/Other Rpd Detectives/D.A.S/Cps	6.9	3.0	10.5	3.8	13.0	6.1
Juvenile Book-In/Juvenile Transport (Letot/County)	0.3	5.4	0.9	0	0	1.3
Juvenile Magistrate Warnings/Interview	0	0.3	0	0	0	0.1
Record/Database Computer Searches (Suspect)	7.2	6.9	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.7
Contacts With Victim, Complainant, Witness	23.1	19.1	17.9	20.3	17.6	19.9
Arrest/Search Warrant/Seizure Preparation	5.1	2.7	2.7	6.1	2.9	4.4
Polygraphs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subpoena Of Records (Grand Jury Signing)	0.3	0.3	2.6	0	1.2	0.6
View Evidence/Dispositions On Property Cards/View Video Evidence	2.6	2.1	2.3	1.7	2.2	2.1
Case Preparation	5.6	10.3	4.7	6.1	4.0	6.4
Photo Line-Ups	1.5	1.9	1.6	3.7	1.2	2.4
Property Recovery/Search For Evidence Or Property	1.2	0.3	7.4	5.4	10.5	4.4
Crime Analysis/Bolos/Intel Dissemination	0.3	0	0.8	2.1	0.4	1.0
Case Correspondence (5 Day Letters) Referrals/ Updates Via Chain	2.2	1.6	0.2	0.2	0	0.8
Surveillance	0	1.6	0	2.6	0	1.3

*(table continues)*

Table 15 (*continued*).

Activity	CAPERS	YCD	FF	Property	OSU	Total
Auto Pound	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neighborhood Canvass	0.3	0.3	0	0	0	0.1
Death Scene Investigation	2.5	0	0	0	0	0.5
Media	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.1
Total Offenses	83	67	22	135	44	351

Detectives spent the majority of their time (65.6%) on six activities as follows: Contacts with Victims and Witnesses (19.9%); Supplemental Report Preparation (17.0%); Login of Case and Case Review (9.2%); Computer Searches for Suspect Information (6.7%); Suspect Interviews/Interrogations (6.4%); and Case Preparation (6.4%). Detectives spent minimal time on activities such as book-in/custody reports, subpoena of records, viewing evidence, photo line-ups, crime analysis, case correspondence, and surveillance.

Detectives in the Youth Crimes Division spent the most time of any unit (10.3%) on Case Preparation, which is most likely explained by the court processing requirements of these cases. Similarly, Youth Crimes detectives spent more time on suspect interviews or interrogations (10.8%) than the other units. This is most likely explained by the fact that most offenders have been identified by parents or witnesses at the time the case is investigated, leading to a higher number of suspects being interrogated by detectives in this unit. Detectives in the Operational Support Unit spent more time on consulting with other agencies (13.0%) than detectives in other units. This variation can be explained by the nature of the work performed in this unit, which involves proactive investigations rather than reactive investigations. Proactive investigations are not initiated in response to a call for service, as is the case with reactive investigations. Similarly, Operational Support Unit detectives spent more time on searching for evidence or property

(10.5%) than detectives in any other unit for a similar reason; the nature of the work performed in this unit involves a higher number of evidence searches due to the narcotics offenses being investigated.

### *All Other Activity*

The analysis of all other activity performed by detectives is presented in Table 16. The table outlines the average weekly time spent on all other activity per person for each unit, as well as a weekly average per person across all units. A total of 24 detectives were assigned to all five units during the four week data collection period. Four detectives were assigned to CAPERS, seven to Youth Crimes, three to Forgery-Fraud, six to Property, and four to OSU.

Table 16

#### *Investigator's Time on Other Activities (Weekly Average per Detective)*

Activity	CAPERS	YCD	FF	Property	OSU	Total
Assist on Case Assigned to Other Detectives	1.93	0.71	1.94	1.58	2.09	1.51
Community Presentations/Meetings	0.06	0.25	0.13	0.36	0.00	0.19
Auction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.03
Vehicle Inspections	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.04	0.03
Vehicle Maintenance and Refuel	0.18	0.10	0.17	0.15	0.22	0.15
Internal Meetings (Sector/Unit/Division)	0.07	0.05	0.25	0.32	0.28	0.19
External Meetings (Intel)	0.13	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.08
Projects/Special Assignments	0.54	0.56	0.38	0.17	11.76	2.30
Assist other Police Departments and other RPD Detectives	0.60	0.55	2.01	0.95	1.06	0.92

*(table continues)*

Table 16 (*continued*).

Activity	CAPERS	YCD	FF	Property	OSU	Total
General Computer Work (emails/timesheets/stats/database entries)	1.65	2.20	3.84	7.18	7.38	4.42
Schools/In Service	0.00	1.71	0.00	0.67	3.00	1.17
Instructing/Training	2.56	0.46	0.67	0.33	1.06	0.91
Court/Grand Jury Testimony	0.37	0.20	0.33	0.60	0.56	0.41
Miscellaneous Delegated Tasks	0.15	0.36	1.60	0.04	0.95	0.50
Complete Monthly Stats	0.21	0.08	0.16	0.27	0.19	0.18
Disposition on Property (other cases)	0.07	0.12	0.37	0.57	0.07	0.25
Sex Offender Related Duties	1.16	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.27
Total Hours	9.67	7.57	11.84	13.67	28.68	13.50

The time spent on each activity was captured in minutes. In order to obtain the weekly average per person, the number of minutes for each detective was totaled for all activities on the time log. The total minutes was divided by 60 minutes to convert the total time into hours. The weekly average was calculated by dividing the total time in hours by the total number of weeks, and dividing that number by the total number of detectives in the division. In order to obtain the total weekly average per person, the total number of hours was divided by 24, the total number of detectives for all units.

Detectives in all five units spent an average of 13.5 hours per week on all other activity not related to current case assignments. Detectives spent more time per week on general computer work, 4.42 hours, than any other activity, followed by 2.3 hours per week on projects and special assignments, and 1.51 hours per week assisting on cases assigned to other detectives.

When reviewing the data by unit, detectives in the Crimes Against Persons Unit spent an average of almost 10 hours per week on other activities. Detectives in the Youth Crimes Unit spent an average of almost 7.5 hours per week on other activities. Detectives in the Forgery-Fraud Unit spent an average of almost 12 hours per week on other activities. Detectives in the Property Crimes Unit spent an average of just over 13.5 hours per week on other activities. Detectives in the Operational Support Unit spent the more time than the other four units, almost 29 hours, on other activities.

Operational Support spent more than half of their work week on other activity not related to case assignments. This is largely due to the nature of the work performed in this unit. The Detectives tend to work on proactive case assignments in this unit which required more time for special projects and assignments, computer work, training, and assisting on cases assigned to other detectives. The vice and narcotics offenses being investigated require these detectives to spend time in this manner.

The amount of time spent on the same activity varied between units. For example, detectives assigned to the Crimes Against Persons, Youth Crimes, and Forgery-Fraud units spent less than 2.5 hours per week on general computer work while detectives assigned to the Property Crime and Operational Support units spent in excess of 7 hours per week on the same activity. Likewise, detectives assigned to Youth Crimes and Forgery-Fraud spent less than one hour per week assisting on cases assigned to other detectives, while detectives assigned to the Crimes Against Persons, Property and Operational Support units spent over 1.5 hours or more per week on the same activity. The Richardson Police Department organizes their investigations division into units based on the offenses being investigated; therefore time variations such as these are due to the nature of the work performed within each unit.

## Summary

The research findings demonstrate that patrol officers have a major impact in solving cases subsequently assigned to investigations in the Richardson Police Department. Patrol officers completed a majority (57.7%) of cases cleared by exception or cleared by arrest and assigned to the investigations division. Patrol officers cleared a higher majority of cases (67.7%) when the sample included only those cases cleared by arrest. The sample of cases involved in this present research included those cases assigned to the investigations division for follow up, and did not include any that were assigned to the case review detective, regardless of whether the sample included cases cleared by exception. Chapter 5 will discuss alternatives for giving patrol officers more time to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation by optimizing the allocation of patrol resources.

The research findings also demonstrated that detectives spent a great deal of time on a variety of daily activities. Detectives spent the majority of their time on case related activities, and also spent significant time per week on tasks not related to investigation of their assigned cases. Chapter 5 will discuss the suggestion that police administrators should identify the investigative activities that can only be performed by sworn personnel and seek alternative means to complete the activities which do not fall within this category.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

The goal of this research study was to assess the impact that the patrol officer has in solving crime in the Richardson Police Department. The following two research questions are addressed by this thesis:

- What role do patrol officers play in solving cases assigned to investigations?
- How do detectives spend their time?

#### Question 1: The Patrol Officer's Role in Solving Crime

The first part of this study evaluated the frequency with which the patrol officers solved cases assigned to the investigations division. The first question was addressed through the analysis of 352 offense reports in order to determine the volume of cases that were solved at the preliminary investigations phase by the patrol officer. The findings from this study revealed that the patrol officer solved a majority of the cases assigned to detectives. This is a determining factor in whether or not the patrol officer should be allocated more time to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation of specific cases. The addition of more resources, or changes in the current allocation of existing resources, will be required in order to give the patrol officer more time to conduct the preliminary investigation. One option available to police departments to accomplish this initiative is the utilization of civilians to perform low risk, low priority tasks currently being performed by patrol officers.

#### *Principal Findings*

Analysis of the patrol officer's impact on case clearance demonstrated that the majority

of cases assigned to the investigations division (57.7%) were actually solved by the patrol officer initially responding to the call for service. This result was clear when considering that all of the cases analyzed in the study were assigned to the investigations division for follow up, and all cases assigned to the case review detective were excluded from the analysis. The patrol officer made the greatest contribution to case resolution in a majority of the cases assigned to the Vice and Narcotics Unit and to the Youth Crimes Unit. Patrol officers solved more than half of the cases of financial fraud and property crime. The patrol officer solved a smaller number of crimes against persons, which the literature confirms are the cases which are solved over a longer period of time and require the specialized training and expertise of a skilled investigator for resolution (Dempsey, 1996).

This result was further enhanced by removing those cases cleared by exception from the study sample, and calculating the percentage of cases where the patrol officer solved the case. This additional analysis revealed that 67.7% of those cases were solved by the patrol officer initially responding to the call for service. When reviewing these cases across units in the investigations division, patrol officers solved a majority of cases in all five units, with the lowest percentage still occurring in the Crimes Against Persons unit.

The findings of this study also identified that patrol officers solve the majority of cases for certain types of offenses. The offenses for which patrol officers clear the majority of cases include burglary, larceny and other property offenses, as well as certain drug and weapons offenses. When exceptionally cleared cases were removed from the sample, patrol officers also solved a majority of the assault cases included in the sample. The literature confirms, however, that violent offenses often require more complex investigation over a longer period of time. As a result, patrol officers should not be given additional time to investigate these types of offenses.



Chapter 2 provided the details of three comprehensive studies on the criminal investigation process. The Rand report confirmed the findings of this present study, that the patrol officer's role in the preliminary investigation is critical to clearing the case. The Rand research (1975) utilized surveys, direct observations, case samples, and interviews to determine that the single most important issue in solving the case was the information supplied by the victim to the first responding patrol officer. The PERF Study (1983) conducted by Eck, utilized activity logs, official reports, direct observations, and case reviews, and confirmed the findings of this present study, that there are some cases more suited to investigation by the patrol officer, such as misdemeanors, larceny cases, and burglary cases.

The National Survey of Police Policies conducted by Horvath and Messig (2001) utilized surveys and data from other national data resources to confirm that properly trained patrol officers should be given more time to conduct the preliminary investigation, which would reduce redundancy in the investigation process. Additional benefits are the reduction in investigation costs to the department, and improved clearance rates because many cases would be closed at the preliminary investigation stage. Horvath and Messig (2001) also found that as many as 80% of the cases cleared by police were the result of arrests at the scene, identification of suspects, or other actions of the first responding officer which directly affected investigative outcomes. Dempsey (1996) also confirmed that if a suspect was not identified during the preliminary investigation, the suspect would most likely not be identified in the future.

#### *Implications: Use of Civilians to Free Patrol Officer's Time*

The major challenge facing police departments is how to effectively free patrol officers from responding to every call for service while maintaining current service levels to the

community. Police departments have known since the publication of the Rand report in the 1970s that patrol officers need more time for preliminary investigation, but the challenge of how to accomplish this is the issue police departments continue to struggle with. The patrol officer's field training should render him or her fully capable of conducting a complete and professional preliminary investigation, however, time constraints as a result of other calls for service are of primary concern (McDevitt, 2005). Some additional training may be required, but over time patrol officers will gain efficiencies in scale as more investigations are performed. The long term result will be that patrol officers will gain greater experience, expanded skills, and improved morale through participation in the process of solving crime (McDevitt, 2005). The efficiency of the follow-up investigation should increase as the quality of information from the first officer continues to improve.

The findings outlined in Chapter 4 showed that patrol officers are critical to the preliminary investigation process. One potential option for freeing the patrol officer's time so that he or she may focus on preliminary investigation is the use of civilian employees in the patrol division. Departmental policy determines whether civilians can perform functions such as call taking or response to calls for service in the field. Likewise, departments would need to determine what types of offenses the patrol officer will be allocated more time to investigate. The findings of this study confirmed that patrol officers solve a majority of Burglary, Larceny and other property offenses, where arrests occur as a result of preliminary investigation. The result is consistent whether the sample of cases in the study included cases cleared by arrest only, or cases cleared by arrest and cleared by exception. The literature recommends that patrol officers should not be responsible for conducting complete investigations for homicides, missing persons, gang-related cases (Skolnick & Bayley, 1986) or in situations where the investigation is

of a continuing nature, is out of the officer's jurisdiction, or involves undercover work over a period of time (Adams, 2001). Thus, it is logical to conclude that departments would benefit from directing patrol officers to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation for property crimes, and not for crimes against persons.

The Santa Ana, California Police Department, for example, uses civilians as Police Service Officers (PSOs) to perform accident investigation, identify and tow abandoned vehicles, or respond to crimes that are not in progress, such as a rape or burglary that happened the day before. PSOs can contact and re-interview victims to obtain additional information (Skolnick & Bayley, 1986). The Anaheim, California Police Department uses civilians to take reports in the field using an automated reporting tool, freeing patrol officers from the burden of completing reports for every call they answer (Welter, 2007).

Another example is the Arlington, Texas Police Department, which uses civilian employees to staff their 'Teleserve' system as part of the differential response policy in the patrol division. Teleserve involves the complainant calling the department where a civilian call taker completes the police report over the telephone. The report is then routed to the appropriate unit for further investigation. This program has enabled Arlington to establish a differential response policy for patrol, where some calls for service are handled over the phone and other calls receive a patrol officer response at the scene (Matrix, 2003). Examples of calls handled by civilians through Teleserve include, but are not limited to, abandoned property or vehicles, commercial or residential burglary, city ordinance violations, parking violations, commercial or residential alarms, criminal mischief report, recovered vehicles, and motor vehicle thefts or attempted theft. This program shifts responsibility for less serious calls from sworn police officers to civilians

without resulting in a change in the quality of service received by the public (Matrix, 2003; [www.arlingtonpd.org](http://www.arlingtonpd.org)).

## Question 2 – The Investigator’s Activities

The second part of this study examined how detectives spent their time, both on case assignments and on other activity. The question was addressed through the evaluation of the detective’s time logs for 351 case assignments over a two month period of time, as well as the time logs over a one month period for all other activities. The findings from this study revealed the detective’s primary activities while conducting case investigations, as well as working on other job responsibilities. These findings serve as a determining factor in whether or not the investigator was working on activities that could be accomplished by patrol officers or other staff members. Utilizing civilians in the investigations division to perform tasks which do not necessarily require a sworn officer will enable the detective to spend more time investigating criminal offenses and solving cases. Efficiency in the criminal investigation process can be improved substantially when the patrol officer is given more time to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation, which in turn improves the information available to the detective during follow-up investigation. Better information coupled with more time should lead to higher crime clearance rates upon full implementation.

## *Principal Findings*

Analysis of the time detectives spent on case-related activity demonstrated that the detectives in all five units spent approximately 20% of their time on the task of contacting victims, complainants or witnesses. The literature confirms the finding of this study, that the

most common task performed during follow-up investigation is the victim interview. The variety of other activities performed, such as report preparation, computer searches, and case preparation demonstrated that the activities performed vary from offense to offense depending on the nature of the leads and information available to the investigator (Eck, 1992). An analysis of the time detectives spent on all other activities revealed that the majority of their time was spent on tasks which did not require the skills of a trained criminal investigator, such as general computer work and database searches.

Chapter 2 provided the details of three comprehensive studies on the criminal investigation process. The Rand report confirmed the findings of this present study, that the detective spends time on tasks that do not require a trained investigator. Greenwood and Petersilia (1975) found that 93% of a detective's time was spent on reviewing reports, documenting files, and attempting to locate witnesses or victims on cases that had a reduced chance of being cleared and that detectives had a minor impact on clearing crimes. Eck (1984) refuted the findings of Rand by concluding that detectives played a major role in the follow-up work conducted on cases. In addition, Eck (1984) found that there are some cases suited to investigation by the patrol officer, such as misdemeanors, larceny cases, and burglary cases, but the more complex cases should be investigated by detectives. The National Survey of Police Policies conducted by Horvath and Messig (2001) confirmed that although the investigation process has shown some advances, overall it remains relatively unchanged by significant improvements in policing over the past thirty years.

#### *Implications - Use of Civilians in the Investigations Division*

Detectives spend time on case investigations, some of which require specialized skill and

some of which are administrative in nature. Detectives also spend time on other activities such as general computer work and record searches which are not always a direct part of the investigative process. The literature supports the fact that detectives must access records either manually or with a computer (Lyman, 1999), but does not reveal efficiencies that could be gained if someone other than the detective performed this function. The use of civilian employees as investigator assistants to perform administrative duties would allow the department to further reduce redundancy and costs and improve case clearance rates (Horvath & Messig, 2001). Clearance rates would be improved through an increase in the amount and quality of information gathered by the patrol officer and forwarded to the detective when the case is assigned to follow-up investigation. As confirmed by the literature, the quality of the preliminary investigation is the key as to whether a follow-up investigation would be successful (Eck, 1984).

Selective civilianization within the investigations division, combined with the expanded participation of patrol officers in preliminary investigation, would enable detectives to spend more time on cases requiring specialized investigative skills. The literature confirms that investigative efficiency is gained when the detectives used their specialized skills to investigate complex cases or cases requiring long-term time commitments (Lyman, 1999). Efficiencies are realized when a higher number of cases are solved at the preliminary investigation stage and limited investigator resources focus on cases that have a chance of being solved (McDevitt, 2005). Investigative efficiency and cost reductions will serve to maintain or increase service levels to the public and maximize overall resource allocation in the department.

The findings in Chapter 4 regarding how detectives spend their time showed that investigators perform many tasks which do not require sworn officer status. Detectives spend a large amount of time interviewing witnesses, performing computer searches, and preparing

reports. Some departments are using civilians to perform these tasks, which provide detectives with more time to conduct those tasks requiring a sworn officer. Individual departments must make the decision as to whether civilians can perform any of the tasks currently performed by sworn investigators, but some departments are successfully implementing this strategy. For example, the Anaheim, California Police Department uses civilians in accident investigation, robbery investigation, narcotics cases, and crime task forces (Welter, 2007).

Another example of civilianization can be found in the Arlington, Texas Police Department, which pioneered the use of civilians to assist with or conduct criminal investigations. In the accident investigations unit, civilians perform all administrative processing for DUI arrests, including processing complaints, obtaining warrants, filing motions and paperwork completed by the arresting officer, processing appropriate paperwork for license revocation, and performing follow-up investigation following arrest for cases involving no insurance (Matrix, 2003)

Civilians in Arlington's central investigations unit are responsible for full caseloads while also supporting the sworn investigators in the unit. Although these civilians cannot participate in the arrest of a potential suspect, they perform activities such as case file review, interview witnesses, obtain follow-up information from financial and other institutions, perform key records checks, conduct criminal background checks, and respond to crime scenes to assist with directing evidence collection, and victim and witness interviews. This has enabled the department to learn that for non-criminal and non-emergency calls for service, well-trained civilians can provide the same service as well-trained police officers (Matrix, 2003).

### *Example of Estimated Time Savings*

It is difficult to understand the impact that a civilian can have to a detective's caseload because police departments do not follow one standard practice for conducting criminal investigations. An example of how time savings can be accomplished is found in Table 17. This table presents tasks that are currently performed by detectives for both case-related activity and other activity not related to current case assignments. The percentage of time detectives across all 5 units spend on the specified task is listed next to the task description, and the percentage is then expressed as a number of hours the detective spends per week on the task based on a 40 hour work week. An arbitrary percentage of civilian contribution is indicated for each task, which represents an estimated time savings per week for the detective if a civilian is assigned to assist with this task. The result is an expression of weekly time that could be saved (in hours) for each of the tasks. In this example, a civilian could reduce the time an investigator spends on case-related activity by 7.58 hours per week, given the time and percentage of impact per task, representing a 25.3% time savings on case related activity per week.

Table 17

#### *Example of Estimated Time Savings through Civilianization, Per Week*

Activities		Det.Time (Hrs)	% Civilian Cont'b	Saved (Hrs)
Case- Related Activities	Login Of Case/Review Of Case (9.2%)	3.68	15%	0.55
	Suspect Interviews/Interrogations (6.4%)	2.56	15%	0.38
	Non-Suspect Record/Computer Searches (4.9%)	1.96	50%	0.98
	Supplement Preparation (17.0%)	6.80	25%	1.70
	Suspect Record/Computer Searches (6.7%)	2.68	50%	1.34
	Contacts With Victim/Complainant/Witness (19.9%)	7.96	25%	1.99
	Case Preparation (6.4%)	2.56	15%	0.38
	Search/Recover Evidence Or Property (4.4%)	1.76	15%	0.26
Subtotal of Case Related Activities		29.96		7.58

*(table continues)*



Table 17 (continued).

Activities		Det.Time (Hrs)	% Civilian Cont'b	Saved (Hrs)
All Other Activities	Assist On Case Assigned To Other Detectives	1.51	10%	0.15
	Community Presentations/Meetings	0.19	50%	0.10
	Projects/Special Assignments	2.30	15%	0.35
	Assist Other Police Departments/Rpd Detectives	0.92	15%	0.14
	General Computer Work	4.42	25%	1.11
	Miscellaneous Delegated Tasks	0.50	25%	0.13
	Complete Monthly Stats	0.18	100%	0.18
	Disposition On Property (Other Cases)	0.25	25%	0.63
	Subtotal All Other Activities	10.27		2.79
Combined Time Savings		40.23		10.37

*Note:* These numbers are averages and are presented for illustrative purposes only.

Similarly, the next section of the table presents tasks that are currently performed by detectives for all other activity not related to current case assignments, and lists the weekly time spent by detectives across all units on the specific task. An arbitrary percentage of civilian contribution is again applied to each task, and the result is an expression of weekly time that could be saved (in hours) for each of the tasks listed. In this example, a civilian could potentially reduce the time an investigator spends on all other activity by 2.79 hours per week, given the time and percentage of impact per task. This number represents a 27.2% time savings on all other activity per week. Departments, as an example, could save an estimated 10.37 hours per week per detective on these selected tasks each week, which represents a 25.8% overall time savings.

Although this example is only an illustration of potential time savings, it is valuable in understanding that departments can achieve cost savings and time savings by utilizing cheaper civilian resources in the investigations division. The use of sworn or civilian personnel within any police department is a matter of departmental policy. A standard does not exist which says that a sworn investigators must perform tasks such as interviewing a victim or witness. The

potential of assigning this task to civilian staff does exist, and over time it is reasonable to conclude that with experience and training civilians could perform investigative activity for many of the cases currently assigned to detectives in the investigations division.

### Discussion on Civilianization

Horvath and Messig (2001) found that 87% of agencies employed full-time non-sworn personnel, which represented an average of 28% of the total personnel for agencies included in the study. Thirty-two percent of agencies responded that civilians were assigned to investigative support tasks such as evidence collection, crime analysis and intelligence, or polygraph, but the specific tasks assigned were not identified. Very few agencies in the study (11%) reported that they employed non-sworn investigators. The Rand report found that less than 25% of agencies employed civilian investigative support personnel. The findings of Horvath and Messig (2001) reveal that there has been minimal change in the use of civilians in investigative support over the past 25 years.

Police departments across the United States are experiencing increased calls for service, increased investigative caseloads, and often resort to widespread use of overtime to maintain current service levels to the communities they serve. Departments have redeployed sworn officers through their agencies or have eliminated special policing units in an effort to support the basic needs of the community while maintaining existing staffing levels. There is not an industry standard that is used for staffing police agencies. Departments are adding staff in strategic locations in order to maintain service levels, without necessarily adding sworn officers. Other personnel such as Police Service Representatives, who are non-sworn patrol assistants, and Civilian Investigators are bridging the service gap for police agencies (Welter, 2007).

There is a growing trend among police departments to establish differential response policies and to deploy civilians to assist with call taking, field report writing, and field response to low priority calls for service. The use of civilian investigators is becoming more widespread as departments deploy civilians to perform much of the background investigation and research that is a part of the criminal investigation process (Welter, 2007). Dempsey (1996) confirmed the advice of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Goals and Standards, which warned that civilians should not be utilized in positions requiring peace officer status, arrest powers, or expertise normally acquired through field experience. Departments are largely following this recommended standard by utilizing civilians to perform the tasks that do not require sworn officers, enabling departments to maintain or improve service levels to the community.

### *Benefits of Civilianization*

The primary advantage of civilian employees is the reassignment of sworn officers from administrative duties to field duties, which improves service to the community, improves efficiency, and increases cost savings to the department (Wilkerson, 1994). Many departments that already employ civilians within the organization have realized cost and time savings in those areas where civilians are assigned. Sworn officers are more expensive than civilian employees due to increased training costs, differential pay, and benefits costs.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics reported in Local Police Departments (2003) that there was an increase in both sworn and non-sworn positions since the last survey report in 2000. The total operational costs for sworn officers were about \$93,300 per officer and about \$71,500 per employee when both sworn and non-sworn positions were taken into account. Operational

budget figures for non-sworn positions were not listed separately in this report (Hickman & Reaves, 2006). Much of the cost differential between sworn and civilian employees is the additional training and equipment costs for sworn employees. Sworn employees are more costly to train and to equip because of the state mandates for officer training, as well as training in firearms skills, investigations, self-defense, criminal law, patrol procedures and techniques, emergency vehicle operations, and basic first aid and CPR (Hickman, 2005).

### *Limitations of Civilianization*

Police departments who are considering similar civilianization efforts to those discussed in Arlington, Texas or Santa Ana, California must realize that there are consequences involved in the decision to civilianize. Gaining acceptance from sworn officers is often the greatest challenge to building a successful civilian workforce. Sworn officers may perceive civilians as a threat to their authority, capability and respect. All levels of management must support civilianization where it is implemented, and must thoroughly explain the role of civilians and sworn officers to both groups (Wilkerson, 1994). Civilianization will require that current staffing levels be evaluated, which will add an increased expense to already limited police department budgets. Staffing consultants may be required in those departments that are unable to evaluate their own effectiveness and identify those areas where civilianization can improve efficiency (Skolnick & Bayley, 1986).

Civilianization is controversial because people do not easily accept change. Sworn officers are concerned that cost-saving initiatives, including civilianization, will reduce their salary. The classification of patrol officers as professionals and civilians as paraprofessionals might alleviate this concern. Civilianization can be impeded by the structural organization of

departments, where the patrol and investigations divisions maintain traditional roles regarding how criminal investigations are conducted. Policing is an organization full of powerful traditions, rendering departments resistant to changes which challenge these traditions in any way (Skolnick & Bayley, 1986).

The success of police innovation is often influenced by factors outside of the direct control of the department. Factors that impede the success of innovation include legislated law enforcement mandates, post September 11<sup>th</sup> security and training requirements, political traditions, power structure of municipal governments, racial discrimination, immigrant populations, and the overall strength of the local economy. These factors are often alluded to as the reasons police chiefs do not introduce innovation into their departments (Skolnick & Bayley, 1986; Welter, 2007).

Care should be taken to determine those cases in which a civilian investigator may interact with a victim. The victim's feelings toward the investigator can influence the quality of information gathered, thereby affecting the outcome of the case. A victim who perceives that the investigator respects his or her situation without offering judgment or blame is more likely to keep the lines of communication open, which facilitates obtaining vital information needed to solve the case (Russell and Light, 2006). Trained civilians are capable of conducting victim and witness interviews, but an inexperienced civilian investigator could negatively impact the interaction with the victim in the same manner as a disinterested sworn investigator. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain a balance in responsibilities, so that civilians are not assigned cases outside of their capabilities.

## Conclusion

The current research study found that patrol officers played a significant role in solving a majority of all cases assigned to the investigations division. The study also found that detectives spent the largest concentration of their time during case investigation contacting witnesses, victims and complainants. Detectives spent the largest amount of their time on computer work and database searches when working on other activity not related to their current case assignments. One implication from these findings is that the implementation of civilian staff in both the patrol and investigations divisions is an alternative that would enable police departments to reallocate available resources.

Civilianization would create additional time for patrol officers to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation. A thorough preliminary investigation will enable detectives to have more time to conduct the follow-up investigation for complex cases and cases not solved at the patrol level. Case clearance rates would improve if departments implement a differential response policy that includes the use of civilians to handle low priority low risk calls for service that require a report without additional investigation. This current research revealed that patrol officers solve a majority of burglary, larceny and other property offenses. Civilianization would provide patrol officers with more time to investigate those property offenses. Utilizing properly trained patrol officers reduces redundancy in the investigation process, reduces costs and increases case clearance rates.

Civilianization would also enable departments to reallocate resources in the investigations division so that detectives spend time on tasks that require their expertise. Case clearance rates would improve if departments would utilize civilians as assistants in the investigations division, or as non-sworn investigators responsible for handling those tasks that do

not require arrest authority, specialized skills, or have a higher personal risk (Wilkerson, 1994). The use of civilian assistants in the investigations division would eliminate the need for a highly specialized detective to perform administrative duties, which would increase investigative efficiency and reduce the costs associated with follow-up investigations, due to the lower salary and benefits costs associated with civilian employees.

More effective preliminary investigations result in increased information available to detectives for cases requiring follow-up investigations. Current call volumes make increased time for preliminary investigation impractical for most police departments. Utilizing civilians within the patrol division is one way to enable patrol officers to have more time to conduct thorough preliminary investigations. Likewise, current caseloads in the investigations division make it impractical for departments not to assign detectives to administrative functions that are part of the follow-up investigation process. The increased thoroughness and quantity of information available to detectives when patrol officers are given more time to conduct the preliminary investigation can be offset by the implementation of civilian investigators. Civilianization in both the patrol and investigations functions of the criminal investigation process serves to improve service levels to the public, to cost-effectively allocate resources, and to increase clearance rates through improved case investigation.

APPENDIX A  
CASE FILE CODE SHEET



**Patrol Officer Investigation Activities  
Case File Code Sheet**

**Case Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Offense Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Rank Order for Clearance Factors**

Mark all factors present at the time the case was assigned to a detective (i.e., at time of case assignment, all work on case had been performed by a patrol officer).

- \_\_\_\_\_ Suspect arrested
- \_\_\_\_\_ Identify suspect through witness/victim (includes known suspects)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Confessions/statements by potential suspects to officers/detectives/citizens
- \_\_\_\_\_ Full or partial license plate that can lead to identification through computer searches
- \_\_\_\_\_ Identify property linked to a suspect
- \_\_\_\_\_ Forensic/DNA analysis/prints/lab
- \_\_\_\_\_ Info on BOLOs/intelligence bulletins/crime analyst/crime stoppers that leads to identification of a suspect
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other evidence (i.e., video surveillance, etc.)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Cell phone information
- \_\_\_\_\_ Patterns of offenses
- \_\_\_\_\_ Witness sketch (Identi-kit)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Citizen calls that are not directly related to any specific offense

**How much impact did the patrol officer have in solving the case?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Minimal (less than 25%)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Moderate (26-74%)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Significant (75-99%)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Completed (100%)

*Note: Appendix A is the property of Justice Research Consultants, LLC, and is used by permission.*

APPENDIX B

CASE-RELATED ACTIVITY TIME CARD

# Investigator's Time Card Case-Related Activity

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Case Assigned to Investigations Division: \_\_\_\_\_

Section/Unit Case Assigned to: \_\_\_\_\_

Investigator Case Assigned to: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal Offense: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal Offense: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal Offense: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal Offense: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Information Report: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Information Report: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Information Report: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Case Enhancers: *Check All That Apply*

Final Disposition Type:

Complex evidence/case  
Multiple victims/witnesses/suspects  
Victim/witness issues (child, elderly,  
disabled, uncooperative, etc.)  
Multiple leads  
Extensive evidence/property  
Multiple charges on one suspect  
Language barriers  
Major case  
Gambling case

Arrest  
Exceptionally Cleared  
Inactive  
Pending with Warrant  
Unfounded

## Criminal Offense Grade Codes:

CM = Capital Murder  
F/1 = First Degree Felony  
F/2 = Second Degree Felony  
F/3 = Third Degree Felony  
SJF = State Jail Felony  
M/A = Class A Misdemeanor  
M/B = Class B Misdemeanor  
M/C = Class C Misdemeanor

Date Case Completed:

\_\_\_\_\_

Activity	Time in Minutes						
Login of Case/Review of Case							
Suspect Interviews/Interrogations							
Record/Database Computer Searches (non-suspect)							
Supplement Preparation							
Locating Wanted Suspects/Runaways							
Book-In/Custody Reports							
Consulting with Other Agencies/Other RPD Detectives/D.A.s/CPS							
Juvenile Book-In / Juvenile Transport (LETOT/County)							
Juvenile Magistrate Warnings/Interview							
Record/Database Computer Searches (suspect)							
Contacts with Victim, Complainant, Witness							
Arrest/Search Warrant/Seizure Preparation							
Polygraphs							
Subpoena of Records (Grand Jury Signing)							
View Evidence/Dispositions on Property Cards/ View Video Evidence							
Case Preparation							
Photo Line-ups							
Property Recovery/Search for Evidence or Property							
Crime Analysis/BOLOs/Intel Dissemination							
Case Correspondence (5-Day Letters) Referrals/ Updates via Chain							
Surveillance							
Auto Pound							
Neighborhood Canvass							

## DEFINITION OF CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

(Page 1 of 2)

<b>Login of Case/Review of Case</b>
<i>Document case receipt and logged into monthly case assignment report. Report is reviewed for viable leads and the leads are prioritized.</i>
<b>Suspect Interviews/Interrogations</b>
<i>Phone/field/station interviews with persons believed to be responsible for the offense.</i>
<b>Record/Database Computer Searches (non-suspect)</b>
<i>Utilization of investigative resources to determine accurate and/or confirm information regarding the case. This can include locating witness and verifying information.</i>
<b>Supplement Preparation</b>
<i>Documentation of information that is developed or received during the course of the investigation.</i>
<b>Locating Wanted Suspects/Runaways</b>
<i>Steps that are undertaken to take subjects into custody. This can include emails and phone calls, trips to make arrests, etc.</i>
<b>Book-In/Custody Reports</b>
<i>From the point after an arrest is made-from transport to completing the booking process and all associated paperwork necessary for arraignment/release purposes.</i>
<b>Consulting with Other Agencies/Other RPD Detectives/D.A.s/CPS</b>
<i>Information gathering/sharing that assists in the development of the case.</i>
<b>Juvenile Book-In / Juvenile Transport (LETOT/County)</b>
<i>Processing of juvenile offenders/runaways and the transport of the juvenile to the appropriate facility.</i>
<b>Juvenile Magistrate Warnings/Interview</b>
<i>Notification of the magistrate to respond to RPD to provide the required warnings to a juvenile. Process of the magistrate providing the warnings through the interview and magistrate interview/statement certification process.</i>
<b>Record/Database Computer Searches (suspect)</b>
<i>Utilization of investigative resources to determine accurate and/or confirm information regarding the case</i>
<b>Contacts with Victim, Complainant, Witness</b>
<i>Phone calls, emails and/or interviews to verify facts and/or obtain any additional information regarding the case.</i>
<b>Arrest/Search Warrant/Seizure Preparation</b>
<i>Arrest and search warrant/affidavit preparation, including any time that is spent getting warrant signed.</i>
<b>Polygraphs</b>
<i>Scheduling and attendance during the polygraph examination.</i>
<b>Subpoena of Records (Grand Jury Signing)</b>
<i>Preparation of subpoena completion, grand jury signature, and execution.</i>
<b>View Evidence/Dispositions on Property Cards/View Video Evidence</b>
<i>Review and release procedure for any evidence that is related to the case.</i>
<b>Case Preparation</b>
<i>Preparation of case report for submission to the appropriate District Attorney's office.</i>
<b>Photo Line-ups</b>
<i>Process of compiling photo lineups and the showing of them to witnesses/suspects/victims.</i>
<b>Property Recovery/Search for Evidence or Property</b>
<i>Time spent conducting searches to collect evidence. Includes consent searches, search warrant execution and property turned in as evidence. This is the process of recovering, weighing and impounding property related to the offense.</i>

## DEFINITION OF CASE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

(Page 2 of 2)

<b>Crime Analysis/BOLOs/Intel Dissemination</b>
---

<i>Review of statistical reports and/or crime data to locate trends or information that may indicate this case is part of an ongoing crime pattern. Dissemination of information to agencies and officers to inform them regarding this offense and to obtain additional information.</i>
---

<b>Case Correspondence (5-Day Letters) Referrals/ Updates via Chain</b>
---

<i>Briefings that are conducted with supervisors that provide updated information that is necessary to inform Command regarding the offense. Also, documentation process to communicate the inability to contact a complainant by phone or person.</i>
--

<b>Surveillance</b>
---------------------

<i>Watching of a place, vehicle or person that is pertinent to case development.</i>
--

<b>Auto Pound</b>
-------------------

<i>Response to any police auto pound that is necessary for investigative follow up.</i>
---

<b>Neighborhood Canvass</b>
-----------------------------

<i>Surveying an offense neighborhood to develop information regarding the case.</i>
---

*Note: Appendix B is the property of Justice Research Consultants, LLC, and is used by permission.*

APPENDIX C  
ALL OTHER ACTIVITY TIME CARD

**Investigator's Time Card**  
**All Other Activity**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Section/Unit: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>MON</b>	<b>TUE</b>	<b>WED</b>	<b>THUR</b>	<b>FRI</b>	<b>SAT</b>	<b>SUN</b>
Assist on Case Assigned to other Detective							
Community Presentations/ Meetings							
Auction							
Vehicle Inspections							
Vehicle Maintenance and Refuel							
Internal Meetings (Sector/Unit/Division)							
External Meetings (Intel)							
Projects/Special Assignments							
Assist other Police Departments and other RPD Detectives							
General Computer Work (emails/ timesheets/stats, database entries)							
Schools/In Service							
Instructing/Training							
Court/Grand Jury Testimony							
Miscellaneous Delegated Tasks							
Other							

*Note: Appendix C is the property of Justice Research Consultants, LLC, and is used by permission.*



## REFERENCES

- Adams, Thomas F. (2001). *Police field operations* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Berry, Gene N. (March, 1984). The uniformed crime investigator: A unique strategy to protect and serve. [Electronic Version] *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 1-6.
- Bohm, Robert M., & Haley, Keith M. (2005). *Introduction to criminal justice* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brandl, Steven & Frank, James. (1994) The relationship between evidence, detective effort, and the disposition of burglary and robbery investigations. *American Journal of Police*, 13, 149-168.
- Buracker and Associates, Public Safety Management Consultants, Law Enforcement Division. (2005). *A management study of the Springfield (Massachusetts) Police Department executive summary*. Harrisonburg, Virginia. Retrieved January 12, 2007 from [http://www.springfieldcityhall.com/COS/Springfld\\_PD\\_Exec.pdf](http://www.springfieldcityhall.com/COS/Springfld_PD_Exec.pdf)
- Catalano, Shannon M. (September, 2006). *National crime victimization survey: Criminal victimization 2005*. [Electronic Version] (United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics No. NCJ-214644). Rockville, Maryland: Office of Justice Programs.
- Chaiken, Jan M., Greenwood, Peter W., & Petersilia, Joan. (June 1976). *The criminal investigation process: A summary report*. [Electronic Version] Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.
- Chaurprakobkit, Sutham. (August 2003) Chapter 6: Police and crime. In *Police in America*. Kennesaw State University. Retrieved March 11, 2007 from <http://ksuweb.kennesaw.edu/~scheurpr/classes/CRJU3310/Pol%20Chapter%206%20Police%20&%20Crime.doc>
- Crime in the United States 2005*. (September 2005). (United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation). Retrieved February 28, 2007, from <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/offenses/clearances/index.html>
- Davis, Marsha. (March, 1998). *Online community development technote 14: Community policing and law enforcement*. (United States Department of Agriculture, Web References for Rural Communities). Washington, DC. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from <http://ocdweb.sc.egov.usda.gov/technotes/tn14.pdf>
- Dempsey, John S. (1996). *An introduction to public and private investigations*. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company.
- Eck, John C. (March 1984). *Research in action: Solving crimes*. [Electronic Version] (United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NIJ Reports/SNI 184, p. 4-8). Rockville, Maryland.

- Eck, John C. (1992). *Criminal Investigation*. Gary W. Cordner and Donna C. Hale, Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (Eds.), *What works in policing? Operations and administration examined*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Forst, Brian (2000). The privatization and civilianization of policing. Charles M. Friel (Ed.) *Boundary changes in criminal justice organizations: Criminal justice 2000. Vol. 2*, 19-79. [Electronic Version] (NCJS Document 185521), Retrieved January 12, 2007, from [http://www.ncjrs.gov/criminal\\_justice2000/vol\\_2/02c2.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.gov/criminal_justice2000/vol_2/02c2.pdf)
- Greenwood, Peter W., & Petersilia, Joan. (October, 1975). *The criminal investigation process, Volume I: Summary and policy implications*. [Electronic Version] Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.
- Greenwood, Peter W., Chaiken, Jan M., Petersilia, Joan, & Prusoff, Linda with contributions from Castro, B., Kellen, K., and Wildhorn, S. (October, 1975). *The criminal investigation process, Volume III: Observations and analysis*. [Electronic Version] Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.
- Greenwood, Peter W., Chaiken, Jan M., & Petersilia, Joan. (1977). *The criminal investigation process*. [Electronic Version] Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Hickman, Matthew J. (January, 2005). *State and local law enforcement training academies 2002*. [Electronic version] (United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJRS Publication No. 204030). Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs.
- Hickman, Matthew J., & Reaves, Brian A. (May, 2006). *Local police departments 2003*. [Electronic Version] (United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJRS Publication No. 210118). Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs
- Horvath, Frank, Messig, Robert T., with the assistance of Lee, Yung Hyeock. (November, 2001). *A national survey of police policies and practices regarding the criminal investigations process: Twenty-five years after Rand*. [Electronic version] (United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NCJRS Publication No. 202902). Rockville, Maryland.
- Lyman, Michael D. (1999). *Criminal investigation: The art and the science* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Matrix Consulting Group. (June, 2003). *The City of Arlington, Texas: Management study of the police department 2003*. [Electronic Version] Retrieved February 23, 2007 from [http://www.ci.arlington.tx.us/pdf/police\\_management\\_study.pdf](http://www.ci.arlington.tx.us/pdf/police_management_study.pdf)
- McDevitt, Daniel S. (2005). *Managing the investigative unit*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, Ltd.

Reaves, Brian A., & Hickman, Matthew J. (October 2002). *Census of state and local law enforcement agencies, 2000*. [Electronic Version] (United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics No. NCJ-194066). Rockville, MD: Office of Justice Programs.

Russell, Mary & Light, Linda. (December, 2006). Police and victim perspectives on empowerment of domestic violence victims. *Police Quarterly*, 9(4), 375-396.

Skolnick, Jerome H. & Bayley, David H. (1986). *The new blue line: Police innovation in six American cities*. New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc.

Stewart, James K. (March, 1984). *NIJ director's notes*. [Electronic Version] (United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NIJ Reports/SNI 184, p. 1). Rockville, MD.

The City of Arlington, Texas Police Department Website contains descriptive information about the organization of the police department, accessed March 7, 2007:  
<http://www.arlingtonpd.org/index.asp>

The City of Richardson, Texas Police Department Website contains descriptive information about the organization of the police department, accessed February 5, 2007:  
<http://www.cor.net/PD/Organizational/Homepage.html>

The City of Richardson, Texas Police Department Case Files

Tracking Number 16: RPD Case Number 04-002796

Tracking Number 22: RPD Case Number 04-004303

Tracking Number 33: RPD Case Number 04-001235

Tracking Number 55: RPD Case Number 04-011940

Tracking Number 67: RPD Case Number 04-018294

Tracking Number 150: RPD Case Number 04-046243

Tracking Number 151: RPD Case Number 04-046244

Tracking Number 161: RPD Case Number 04-048544

Tracking Number 167: RPD Case Number 04-049416

Tracking Number 173: RPD Case Number 04-051083

Tracking Number 207: RPD Case Number 04-066321

Tracking Number 259: RPD Case Number 04-084045

Tracking Number 277: RPD Case Number 04-087338

Tracking Number 295: RPD Case Number 04-093096

Tracking Number 305: RPD Case Number 04-097848

U. S. Census Bureau. (2001). *Demographic data for Richardson, Texas*. Retrieved February 16, 2007 from [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\\_bm=yand-geo\\_id=16000US4861796and-qr\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF4\\_U\\_DP1and-ds\\_name=Dand-lang=en](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?_bm=yand-geo_id=16000US4861796and-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF4_U_DP1and-ds_name=Dand-lang=en)

Welter, John. (January 30, 2007). *Anaheim City County meeting: Item #30 – Police department staffing and crime trends*. Retrieved March 7, 2007 from <http://www.anaheim.net/images/section/124/PoliceStaffingCrimeTrends.pdf>

Wilkerson, Bruce D. (November, 1994). Civilian services - civilian employees for police departments. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*. [Electronic Version]. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2194/is\\_n11\\_v63/ai\\_16473802](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2194/is_n11_v63/ai_16473802)